

INTERCOLLEGIATE POULTRY JUDGING CONTEST
1920 - 1932



A-B-4-5-1-0

EXCLUSIVE TO YOU IN YOUR AREA

SUMPTUOUS TURKEY BARBECUE

Beat the heat of summer with a barbecue — a turkey barbecue, that is. For turkey, the best meat buy of the season, is at its succulent best when cooked over hot coals on a spit.

As one savors the juicy white slices of breast meat, edged with crusty barbecue flavor, it seems immaterial that here is one of the most protein-laden meats available. And what's more, it's low, low in fat — a complete denial of the old statement that everything good to eat is fattening.

What to serve with barbecued turkey? Garden salad laced with thick roquefort dressing, fresh corn on the cob brushed with chili-seasoned butter, quick 'n easy hot rolls, and a frost fruit bowl for dessert.

The menu simple. The food exquisite.

BARBECUED TURKEY

Superb Barbecue Sauce:

1/4 cup vinegar
1/2 cup water
1/4 cup brown sugar
2 teaspoons prepared mustard
1/4 teaspoon pepper
1 teaspoon salt
1/8 teaspoon cayenne pepper

1 tablespoon lemon juice
1 medium onion, thinly sliced
1/4 teaspoon butter
1/2 cup catsup
2 tablespoons Worcestershire Sauce
1 teaspoon smoke salt (or liquid
or powdered smoke)

Combine vinegar, water, sugar, mustard, pepper, salt, cayenne, lemon juice, onion, and butter. Simmer, uncovered, for 20 minutes. Add remaining ingredients and bring to a boil. Makes about 1-3/4 cups.

To Barbecue Turkey on Charcoal Rotisserie:

If turkey is frozen, thaw, rinse, and pat dry. Birds weighing 6 to 12 pounds are best for rotisserie cooking. Some rotisseries may be limited to a certain maximum weight, so check manufacturer's weight suggestions before buying turkey.

Start charcoal briquet fire about 20 to 30 minutes before time to cook, allowing about 5 pounds charcoals for beginning fire. As turkey cooks and fire burns, push burning charcoals to center and add new briquettes as needed around edge.

Do not stuff birds for rotisserie cooking. Sprinkle inside body cavities generously with barbecue salt or seasoning, using 2 or 3 tablespoons, then prepare bird as you would for roasting, flattening wings over breast and tying securely.

Insert spit rod in front of tail; run diagonally through breast bone. Fasten tightly with spit forks at both ends and tie legs together securely with twine. Test carefully for balance, readjusting spit rod until bird is well-balanced. Insert meat thermometer in thickest part of inside thigh, making sure thermometer bulb does not touch bone or spit rod and also that thermometer will clear charcoal as spit turns.

When coals are ready, knock off gray ash and push coals to back of firebox, and during cooking add more charcoal around edges as needed to keep heat even. Place drip pan made of heavy duty aluminum foil directly under turkey in front of coals.

Attach spit and start rotisserie. Cook approximate length of time indicated on Timetable for Rotisserie Cooking below. Baste generously and frequently with barbecue sauce the last 30 minutes of cooking. Turkey will brown quickly with addition of barbecue sauce, so do not brush on until the last 30 minutes.

Because of differences in individual barbecues and rotisseries, the cooking time given in Timetable below is only approximate. The turkey is done when roast meat thermometer reaches 180° to 185° F., or when the thickest part of drumstick feels soft.

Rotisserie Timetable for Whole Turkey

<u>Pounds</u>	<u>Hours</u>
6 to 8 pounds	2-1/2 to 3 hours
8 to 12 pounds	3 to 4-1/2 hours
12 to 13 pounds	4-1/2 to 5-1/2 hours

Thick Roquefort Salad Dressing:

3 tablespoons chopped onion	1/4 cup wine vinegar
1 cup mayonnaise	1 tablespoon lemon juice
1 clove garlic, minced or juiced	4 ounces roquefort (or bleu) cheese
1/4 cup chopped parsley, fresh or dried	Salt and pepper
1/2 cup dairy sour cream	

Combine all ingredients and blend with beater or blender. Chill and use within day or two. Makes 1 pint dressing. Serve over salad of fresh, crisp greens and tomatoes.

P R E F A C E

The information assembled in the accompanying five books has been taken from the files of the several contest managers. Pertinent material has been compiled that will preserve as much history of the contest as possible.

These books are being presented to the American Poultry Historical Society to be placed with other poultry material of historical value, where they will be accessible to everyone interested.

The Midwest Intercollegiate Poultry Judging Contest

1920 - 1965

The first Midwest Intercollegiate Poultry Judging contest was held in November, 1920. The individuals responsible for the organization and the operation of this first contest were Professor H. L. Kempster, University of Missouri; Professor H. A. Bittenbender, Iowa State College; and Professor H. L. Schwartz and Professor A. G. Phillips of Purdue University. Since then there have been many individuals who have given much of their time to the contest, but no attempt will be made to add to the above list as it would be very long and there is a risk, because of insufficient records, that some names would be omitted.

It should be of interest to the reader to learn that the contests had not only the support of the coaches and others of the educational institutions but as well that of many people of the commercial field. This latter group included personnel of feed companies, poultry equipment manufacturers, poultry product processors, meat packing plants, poultry breeders, poultry publishing companies, poultry products promotion groups, and state and other poultry associations. Reference of the reader is directed to the list included in the packets assembled for each contest for those commercial companies who have given their support.

After the first few years the leadership of the contest was given to a manager elected by the coaches. It was his duty to make all arrangements such as finding a location for the contest; soliciting financial support; securing satisfactory rings of birds and the poultry products needed; setting up the contest; assuming responsibility for the scoring of all placings; and the awarding of prizes to the winners. For these forty-two contests there were four managers: A. G. Phillips, H. A. Bittenbender, L. E. Card, and E. E. Schnetzler.

In the late years, a committee consisting of Chicago personnel solicited funds and served as hosts to the contestants and their coaches while they were in

Chicago. An educational tour to points of interest and the annual awards banquet were the feature activities sponsored by this group.

The educational tours included trips to the Chicago Mercantile Exchange, The Board of Trade, Fulton Street Market, Poultry and Egg National Board Offices and Kitchens, poultry processing plants, cold storage plants, meat packing and dressing plants, feed mills, and other points with specific interests.

In the early years, one main attraction was the Chicago Colesium Poultry Show which was one of the best exhibits of exhibition poultry in this country. Certainly this fine display of the many varieties and breeds of poultry was an educational feature for the contestants which could not have been found elsewhere. Following the discontinuance of the poultry show the contestants had the opportunity to visit the International Livestock Show where the best in livestock is assembled. These exhibits, including the tour, were extras that were certainly worth much to the students. In the correspondence, statements were found indicating that the coaches were of the opinion that this feature of the contest was of equal value to the student as the competition.

All but one of the forty-two contests held over this forty-six year period were held in Chicago. The first contest after the war, 1946, was held at Purdue University. During the period of the war, 1942 thru 1945, no contests were held. The minutes of the coaches meeting of one of the early contests reveals that some consideration was given to moving the contest to St. Louis. A committee was appointed to make recommendations but no committee report could be found, and no change in location for the contest was made.

All who had an interest in the contest over the period of years are indebted to many commercial companies for furnishing space and facilities for setting up the classes and the poultry products. These included the Chicago Colesium Poultry Show, International Livestock Show, Central Cold Storage, Terminal Building, Quaker Oats Company, Merchandise Mart, and Navy Pier.

During this period of forty-two years, 521 teams were in competition, making an average of 12.5 teams per contest. (Reference of the reader is directed to Tables 1, 2, and 3). Since three members made up each team, this means that 1563 individuals had the opportunity to match their skill with others in judging poultry and poultry products. Many of the teams had an alternate, with some having two. This could add at least another 521 students, bringing the total to 2084, who had the opportunity to participate in the contest or activities associated with it. Those who have been affiliated with the operation of the contest can look at this number and feel compensated for their contribution in helping many students learn more about poultry, poultry products, and the poultry industry.

The contest at first included two divisions, referred to then as utility and exhibition judging. The utility division included four classes of yearling hens to be placed according to past production. These birds were obtained from experiment stations who could supply egg production records which were used for the official placing. It was interesting to learn that this practice was followed throughout the entire period of the contest. The name of this division was later changed to production judging, and production pullets were substituted for two rings of production hens; but these two changes were basically the only changes made in this division over the forty-two contests.

The exhibition division in the beginning included classes of males and females of the most common varieties; White Leghorns, Barred Rocks, Rhode Island Reds, and White Wyandottes. These birds were obtained from exhibition breeders and from stock on exhibit in the Chicago Coliseum Poultry Show. Exhibition breeders were used in the early years to make the official placings. In the late years, a committee of coaches made the placings.

The exhibition division continued as such until 1947, the 24th contest, when the name was changed to breed selection. Two classes of exhibition were dropped at this time and the Record of Performance section was added. In this section 20 males and/or females of the common breeds were included and the contestant was

asked to examine each, and either reject or pass the bird as qualifying for R.O.P. This section was changed in 1952 so that the contestant needed only to examine the bird for disqualifications, and either declare it free or if the bird had a disqualification it had to be listed.

The next change in this division came in 1957 when the exhibitions classes were discontinued and three classes of market type breeding pullets were added. From hereon this division was made-up of these three classes plus the section of the examination of birds for disqualifications.

One early major change in the contest was the addition of a written examination covering the American Standard of Perfection. This was done in 1924, the Fifth contest. Contestants were first quizzed covering the entire contents of the Standard. In 1932 the examination was limited to certain parts of the book, and in 1933 it was discontinued. The scores on the examination were given equal weight to production and exhibition judging in the official placings.

Another major change was made in 1932 when market products were added on an experimental basis. The contestants were asked to place five classes of market poultry, fowl and roasters, and five classes of eggs. It was not until after this division of the contest had been tried out for three years were the scores included in the official placings of the teams and the individuals; and the three divisions; production judging, breed selection, and market products, were established and prizes awarded to individuals and teams within each.

Some changes in the market products division included the grading of poultry and eggs according to U.S. Grades. One of the last changes of importance was the grading of eggs on a broken-out basis as well as by candling.

The changes in the contest followed along with the changes in the poultry industry. After the early years less emphasis was placed on exhibition poultry and more importance given to production, and market eggs and market poultry. In the late years, the contestant was getting a well rounded training in poultry and

poultry products judging; including the judging of production yearling hens, production pullets, and market type breeding pullets; examination birds for disqualifications and defects; grading of dressed poultry; grading of broken-out eggs, and grading of eggs by candling. Certainly those students receiving this broad training in knowing and recognizing good quality were well equipped to bring much to the poultry industry and agriculture.

1907	1	California	California	California
1908	2	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1909	3	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1910	4	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1911	5	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1912	6	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1913	7	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1914	8	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1915	9	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1916	10	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1917	11	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1918	12	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1919	13	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1920	14	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1921	15	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1922	16	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1923	17	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1924	18	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1925	19	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1926	20	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1927	21	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1928	22	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1929	23	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1930	24	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1931	25	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1932	26	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1933	27	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1934	28	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1935	29	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1936	30	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1937	31	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1938	32	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1939	33	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1940	34	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1941	35	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1942	36	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1943	37	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1944	38	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1945	39	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1946	40	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1947	41	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1948	42	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1949	43	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1950	44	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1951	45	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1952	46	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1953	47	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1954	48	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1955	49	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1956	50	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1957	51	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1958	52	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1959	53	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1960	54	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1961	55	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1962	56	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1963	57	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1964	58	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1965	59	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1966	60	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1967	61	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1968	62	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1969	63	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1970	64	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1971	65	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1972	66	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1973	67	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1974	68	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1975	69	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1976	70	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1977	71	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1978	72	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1979	73	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1980	74	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1981	75	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1982	76	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1983	77	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1984	78	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1985	79	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1986	80	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1987	81	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1988	82	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1989	83	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1990	84	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1991	85	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1992	86	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1993	87	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1994	88	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1995	89	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1996	90	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1997	91	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1998	92	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
1999	93	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
2000	94	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
2001	95	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
2002	96	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
2003	97	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
2004	98	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
2005	99	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho
2006	100	Idaho	Idaho	Idaho

<u>Year</u>	<u>No. of Teams</u>	<u>First</u>	<u>Second</u>	<u>Third</u>
1920	3	Missouri	Purdue	Iowa
1921	7	Oklahoma	Iowa	Nebraska
1922	8	Iowa	Purdue	Kansas
1923	8	Missouri	Michigan	Iowa
1924	9	Michigan	Iowa	Purdue
1925	10	Purdue	Iowa	Oklahoma
1926	10	Iowa	Missouri	Kansas
1927	10	Illinois	Arizona	Purdue
1928	10	Iowa	Kansas	Oklahoma
1929	11	Kansas	Minnesota	Illinois
1930	10	Iowa	Kansas	Pennsylvania
1931	7	Oklahoma	Iowa	Kansas
1932	8	Kansas	Missouri	Oklahoma
1933	9	Kansas	Missouri	Pennsylvania
1934	6	Iowa	Texas	Oklahoma
1935	8	Purdue	Texas	Nebraska
1936	6	Minnesota	Texas	Missouri
1937	10	Purdue	Missouri	Nebraska
1938	9	Kansas	Oklahoma	Purdue
1939	11	Illinois	Minnesota	Mississippi
1940	15	Kansas	Purdue	Illinois
1941	15	Missouri	Connecticut	Texas
1942	NO CONTEST			
1943	NO CONTEST			
1944	NO CONTEST			
1945	NO CONTEST			
1946	6	Missouri	Kansas	Iowa
1947	16	Minnesota	Texas	Missouri
1948	16	Arkansas	Kansas	Texas
1949	17	Texas	Iowa	Oklahoma
1950	19	Kansas	North Carolina	Missouri
1951	21	Kansas	Texas	Kentucky
1952	22	Kansas	Texas	Arkansas
1953	22	Texas	Arkansas	North Carolina
1954	21	Kansas	Texas	Arkansas
1955	20	Arkansas	Texas	Cornell
1956	17	Missouri	Arkansas	Kentucky
1957	19	Texas	Kansas	Arkansas
1958	22	Kansas	Texas	Oklahoma
1959	16	Oklahoma	North Carolina	Kansas
1960	15	Kansas	Oklahoma	Arkansas
1961	12	Oklahoma	Arkansas	Pennsylvania
1962	10	Oklahoma	Georgia	Missouri
1963	10	Oklahoma	Arkansas	Missouri
1964	12	Arkansas	Oklahoma	Southern Illinois
1965	8	Oklahoma	Arkansas	Kentucky

Total 521 teams and 1563 contestants.

TABLE NO. 2 - NUMBER OF TEAMS IN COMPETITION BY YEARS



Table 3. Number of Times Teams Placed Either First, Second or Third

<u>Institution</u>	<u>First</u>	<u>Second</u>	<u>Third</u>
Missouri	4	4	5
Purdue	3	3	3
Iowa	5	5	2
Oklahoma	7	3	6
Nebraska			3
Kansas	11	5	4
Michigan	1		
Illinois	2		2
Arizona		1	
Minnesota	2	2	
Pennsylvania			3
Texas	3	10	1
Mississippi			1
Connecticut		1	
Arkansas	3	5	4
North Carolina		2	1
Kentucky			3
New York			1
Georgia		1	
Southern Illinois			1

BOOK I

INTERCOLLEGIATE POULTRY

JUDGING CONTESTS

1920 - 1932

FIRST MID-WEST INTERCOLLEGIATE POULTRY JUDGING CONTEST

Chicago, Illinois - December, 1920

Three institutions entered teams in the First Midwest Intercollegiate Poultry Judging Contest held in Chicago in 1920. The institutions and their coaches in order of their placing were:

University of Missouri - Professor H. L. Kempster
Purdue University - Professor H. L. Schwartz
Iowa State College - Professor H. A. Bittenbender

The contest was held in December in conjunction with the Colesium Poultry Show, one of the outstanding exhibits of exhibition poultry in the United States. The charter individuals who were instrumental in organizing and setting up the contest were Professor H. L. Kempster, University of Missouri; Professor H. A. Bittenbender, Iowa State College; and Professors H. L. Schwartz, Roy E. Roberts, and A. G. Phillips, Purdue University.

The contest was made up of eight classes of poultry: four classes of exhibition pullets or cockerels of Rhode Island Reds, Plymouth Rocks, White Leghorn, and White Wyandottes; and four classes of production yearling hens, White Leghorns, Barred Plymouth Rocks, Rhode Island Reds, and White Wyandottes. The production rings were obtained from the educational institutions and exhibition poultry from breeders of fancy poultry. Mr. L. J. Demberger, a White Wyandotte breeder of Stewartsville, Indiana was asked to place the classes of exhibition poultry. The production classes were placed on their trapnest egg production records supplied by the institution.

Detailed records of the scores of the individuals and the teams are not available, but the team placings are as listed above.

University of Missouri Winning Team

M. J. Bonham; E. W. Henderson; H. L. Kempster, Coach; M. A. Seaton



First Midwest Intercollegiate

Poultry Judging Contest

1920

Packet contains:

1. Early correspondence relative to organization and set-up of contest.
2. Sponsors and Financial Statement.

Make-up of Contest:

Exhibition Judging - Four four-bird rings

Rhode Island Red Cockerels
White Leghorn Cockerels
Barred Plymouth Rock Pullets
White Wyandotte Pullets

Production Judging - Four four-bird rings

White Leghorn Yearling Hens
Rhode Island Red Yearling Hens
Barred Plymouth Rock Yearling Hens
White Wyandotte Yearling Hens

SECOND MID-WEST INTERCOLLEGIATE POULTRY JUDGING CONTEST

Chicago, Illinois - December, 1921

The Second Mid-west Intercollegiate Poultry Judging Contest was made up of seven teams from Oklahoma A & M College, Iowa State College, University of Nebraska, Purdue University, University of Missouri, Kansas State Agricultural College, and Michigan State College.

This contest followed the same pattern of the first being held in connection with the Chicago Colesium Poultry Show, and being made up of classes of production and exhibition poultry.

Oklahoma A & M College, coached by Harry Embleton, had the winning team with the other teams placing in the order as given above.

Oklahoma A & M College Winning Team


Floyd Beanblossom, Thomas Kirkpatrick, Russel Ludwick

Individual Perfect Score

Exhibition Judging	400
Production Judging	400
Contest	800



Floyd Beanblossom



Thomas Kirkpatrick
Third in Exhibition
Judging; Score 290
Nineteenth in Production
Judging; Score 265
Fifteenth in Contest;
Score 555

Oklahoma A. & M. College
1921 Team at Midwest
Intercollegiate Poultry

Team Perfect Score

Exhibition Judging	120
Production Judging	120
Contest	240



Russel Ludwick

THIRD MID-WEST INTERCOLLEGIATE POULTRY JUDGING CONTEST

Chicago, Illinois - December, 1922

The Third Mid-West Intercollegiate Poultry Judging Contest was made up of eight teams from Iowa State College, Purdue University, Kansas State College, Michigan State College, University of Missouri, Oklahoma A & M College, University of Nebraska, and University of Wisconsin.

Professor A. G. Phillips of Purdue University acted as superintendent of the contest, with Professor H. L. Kempster of the University of Missouri in charge of the prizes, and Professor H. A. Bittenbender of Iowa State College in charge of scoring contestants.

The contest consisted of one class each of White Leghorns, Barred Plymouth Rocks, Rhode Island Reds and White Wyandotte production yearling hens. Each class was placed by the trapnest egg production record furnished by the institution furnishing the birds. Also in this contest were four classes of exhibition stock: White Leghorn cockerels, Rhode Island Red cockerels, White Wyandotte hens, and Barred Plymouth Rock pullets. Some of the exhibition stock was taken from the show room and some was sent in by breeders of fancy poultry.

The Iowa State College team coached by H. A. Bittenbender placed first, followed by Purdue University, Kansas State College and Michigan State College.

Iowa State College Winning Team

Front row: Professor H. A. Bittenbender, R. L. Watkins, L. C. Deal
Back row: C. A. Shellanbarger, H. E. Gordon, W. L. Brown



Third Midwest Intercollegiate

Poultry Judging Contest

1922

Packet contains:

1. Instructions to contestants and coaches from Manager of Contest, Professor A. G. Phillips.
2. Letter to Dr. L. E. Card, University of Illinois from Professor L. F. Payne, Kansas State College relative to 1921 and 1922 contests.
3. Letter to Professor Robert Penquite, Iowa State College from Professor H. L. Kempster, University of Missouri relative to the early contests.
4. List of donors of prizes and cash.

Make-up of Contest:

Exhibition Judging - Four four-bird rings

White Leghorn Cockerels
Rhode Island Red Cockerels
Barred Plymouth Rock Pullets
White Wyandotte Pullets

Production Judging - Four four-bird rings

White Leghorn Yearling Hens
Rhode Island Red Yearling Hens
White Wyandotte Yearling Hens
Barred Plymouth Rock Yearling Hens

4th ANNUAL INTERCOLLEGIATE POULTRY JUDGING CONTEST

Chicago, Illinois - December 13, 1923

Institution

University of Missouri
Michigan State College
Iowa State College
University of Illinois
University of Wisconsin
Purdue University
Kansas State Agr. College
University of Nebraska

Coach

Professor E. W. Henderson
Professor E. C. Foreman
Professor H. A. Bittenbender
Professor L. E. Card
Professor C. E. Lampman
Professor L. H. Schwartz
Professor L. F. Payne
Professor S. J. Marsdon

University of Missouri Winning Team

Front row: Frank Wright; R. M. Smith; H. L. Allen; C. G. Fox
Back row: E. W. Henderson and H. L. Kempster, Coaches



THE POULTRY JUDGING CONTEST

NAME: Midwest Intercollegiate Poultry Judging Contest

PLACE AND DATE OF CONTEST: Coleanum Poultry Show, Chicago, Illinois, December 13, 1923, beginning at 8:30 a.m. in the annex.

SUPERINTENDENT OF CONTEST: A. G. Phillips, Purdue University, Lafayette Indiana.

PRIZES: In charge of L. E. Card, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

SELECTION OF BIRDS TO BE JUDGED: In charge of A. G. Phillips, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana.

METHODS OF GRADING CONTESTANTS: In charge of H. A. Bittenbender, Ames Iowa.

CLASSES OF BIRDS TO BE JUDGED: One class each of White Leghorns, Barred Plymouth Rocks, Rhode Island Reds and White Wyandotte yearling hens for Production judging and one class each of White Leghorn cocks, Rhode Island Red cockerels, White Wyandotte pullets and Barred Plymouth Rock pullets for Exhibition judging. There will be four birds in each class.

METHODS OF PLACING AWARDS: The Production hens will be judged from actual trap-nest record for their first year. The Exhibition birds will be judged and placed by a reliable judge who may invite assistance from specialty judges as he desires. His decision on any group in the Exhibition classes will be final. All Exhibition birds will be judged by the American Standard of Perfection.

TIME OF CONTEST: The contest will commence at 8:30 in the morning of the date chosen and 15 minutes will be allowed for judging each class. No intermission will be allowed any contestant and he will judge all classes in two hours.

MEMBERSHIP OF TEAM: There will be three members of each team with one alternate (optional). Membership to this team is open to any student regularly enrolled in the four-year Agricultural course, who has been in attendance at the college he represents for at least one full school year and who at the time of the competition is regularly enrolled in the college where he has completed one years work and whose work in his classes is of a passing grade. The instructors or coaches in charge of each team shall be responsible for the credentials of that team.

No student is eligible for more than one contest.

Each college sending in a competing team will file with the superintendent of the contest, one week prior to the contest, the names of the coach, the three contestants and the alternate with the class numerals of each. This list may be changed immediately prior to the contest if the college so desires.

METHODS OF JUDGING CONTESTANTS:

There will be no reasons required for any placings made. Disqualifications are to be considered only when judging the exhibition classes. A system or method of grading of contestants will be agreed

upon by the coaches in charge of the teams in meeting on the night before the contest.

Each team shall be on hand at a designated place at least 30 minutes prior to the commencing of the contest. The actual supervision of the contest shall be in charge of the superintendent selected by the coaches of the preceding contest. This superintendent shall have charge of the management and the details of the contest and all matters pertaining to it shall be referred to him unless otherwise provided for.

A person shall be selected by the superintendent to be in charge of the contest room during the contest and any contestant desiring to converse or ask questions while judging must appeal to this man.

Each student judge shall be required to write his placings on a blank which shall be provided, the same to be handed to the person in charge of the contestants as soon as the class has been judged. A record blank will bear the contestants number, the name of the class to be judged and the placings of the birds in the class.

The birds in the Production classes to be judged shall be sent in by a college Poultry Department where authentic trap-nest records have been kept. The birds shall be shipped so as to reach the show at least one full day and probably two, before opening of the judging contest. They shall be cooped in a separate room and in single tiers of coops, so arranged as to obtain the best light possible and provide convenience for the contestants. The egg records of these birds will be mailed in sealed envelopes to the superintendent prior to the contest. The outside of these letters will be marked "Egg Records". They will not be opened until the committee on awards asks for them.

The birds in the Exhibition classes to be judged shall be either taken from unplaced birds in the show room or be shipped in for contest purposes. They will be shipped and placed in a manner similar to birds in the production classes. The birds will be placed by a judge, selected as previously described, prior to the contest, and these placings kept by himself in a sealed envelope until such time as the committee on awards requests them.

The Committee on Awards consisting of four men will be selected by the coaches of the teams competing. Awards will be compiled on the basis of the numbers of the contestants. Appeals on decisions may be made by this committee but the conclusions made at the conclusion of the contest shall be final.

In case of a tie in scores, the decision will be given to the team or individual having the greatest number 100 grades and if the tie still persists, to the greatest number of 85 grades.

To the winning team shall be awarded a \$75 silver trophy to be held by the college they represent for the ensuing year and to become the permanent property of the college winning it for a third time.

upon by the coaches in charge of the teams in meeting on the night before the contest.

Each team shall have a designated place at least 30 minutes prior to the beginning of the contest. The subject matter of the contest shall be in charge of the superintendent selected by the coaches of the opposing contest. This superintendent shall have charge of the management and the details of the contest and all matters pertaining to it shall be referred to him unless otherwise provided for.

A person shall be selected by the superintendent to be in charge of the contest room during the contest and any contestant desiring to converse or ask questions while judging must appeal to this person.

Each contestant shall be required to write his classification a blank which shall be provided, the same to be handed to the person in charge of the contestants as soon as the class has been judged. A record blank will bear the contestant's number, the name of the class to be judged and the results of the class in the contest.

The birds in the Production classes to be judged shall be sent in by a college poultry department where entrance trophies records have been kept. The birds shall be shipped as to reach the show at least one day and probably two, before opening of the judging contest. They shall be caged in a separate room and in single tiers of cages, so arranged as to obtain the best light possible and provide convenience for the contestants. The egg records of these birds will be mailed in sealed envelopes to the superintendent prior to the contest. The outside of these letters will be marked "Egg Records". They will not be opened until the committee on awards asks for them.

The birds in the Exhibition classes to be judged shall be either taken from exhibitors birds in the show room or be shipped in for contest purposes. They will be shipped and placed in a kennel similar to birds in the production classes. The birds will be placed by judges, selected as previously described, prior to the contest, and these judges kept or himself in a sealed envelope until such time as the committee on awards requests them.

The Committee on Awards consisting of four men will be selected by the coaches of the teams competing. Awards will be compiled on the basis of the numbers of the contestants. Appeals on decisions may be made by this committee but the conclusions made at the conclusion of the contest shall be final.

In case of a tie in scores, the decision will be given to the team or individual having the greatest number of 100 grades and if the tie still persists, to the greatest number of 85 grades.

To the winning team shall be awarded a \$25 silver trophy to be held by the college they represent for the ensuing year and to become the permanent property of the college winning it for a third time.

To the team with the highest grade in Production judging shall be awarded a \$25.00 silver cup to become the permanent property of the college it represents.

To the winning team in Exhibition judging shall be awarded a \$25.00 silver cup to become the permanent property of the college it represents.

To the individuals ranking first, second and third in Utility judging and to the individuals ranking first, second and third in Exhibition judging shall be awarded gold, silver and bronze medals respectively.

To the individuals ranking first, second and third in judging both the Utility and Exhibition classes shall be awarded suitably inscribed ribbons, blue, red and white in color.

Other prizes may be awarded.

To the team with the highest grade in Production Judging shall be awarded \$25.00 silver cup to possess the permanent property of the college it represents.

To the winning team in Exhibition Judging shall be awarded \$25.00 silver cup to possess the permanent property of the college it represents.

To the individuals ranking first, second and third in Utility Judging and to the individuals ranking first, second and third in Exhibition Judging shall be awarded gold, silver and bronze medals respectively.

To the individuals ranking first, second and third in Judging on the Utility and Exhibition classes shall be awarded suitably marked ribbons, blue, red and white in color.

Other prizes may be awarded.

SUGGESTIONS CONCERNING METHODS OF GRADING CONTESTANTS
MIDWEST INTERCOLLEGIATE JUDGING CONTEST, CHICAGO, 1923.

1. A committee of not less than three and possibly four to grade the cards as turned in.
2. That two records of the grades be kept by two members of the committee.
3. That no persons, except the committee in charge of grading, have any knowledge of the standing of the contestants or the placings of the classes until the contest is finished.
4. All disqualifications listed by students not indicated by the judge should be referred at the end of the contest to a committee whose duty shall be to verify the disqualifications.
5. No member of the grading committee should be permitted to converse with any of the contestants or alternates until after the contest is finished.

RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING AMOUNT
TO BE DEDUCTED FOR MISPLACING.

- (a). Every class should be considered separately and individually and given a different grade according to the closeness of the placings.
- (b). In the case of very close pairs, five points should be deducted for a switch. Where the pairs are not so close ten points shall be deducted. Where the class is average throughout with no close pairs, the regular out of fifteen points shall be allowed.
- (c). In any case where the contestant fails to recognize the close pairs and separates the pair with another individual, the regular out of fifteen points shall be used.
- (d). The following method can be used in determining the closeness of the placings. In the case of exhibition classes have the judge in charge make notes on each class indicating if there are any close pairs, and if so whether they are very close or reasonably close. In the case of the production class, the manager of the contest selects someone to rate the production classes, if possible, the same man that places the production classes. If not, the manager of the contest.

MIDWEST INTERCOLLEGIATE JUDGING CONTEST, CHICAGO, 1923. SUGGESTIONS CONCERNING METHODS OF GRADING CONTESTANTS

1. A committee of not less than three and possibly four to grade the cards as turned in.

2. That two records of the grades be kept by two members of the committee.

3. That no persons, except the committee in charge of grading, have any knowledge of the standing of the contestants or the placings of the classes until the contest is finished.

4. All disqualifications listed by students not indicated by the judge should be referred at the end of the contest to a committee whose duty shall be to verify the disqualifications.

5. No member of the grading committee should be permitted to converse with any of the contestants or alternates until after the contest is finished.

RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING AMOUNT TO BE DEDUCTED FOR MISPLACING.

(a). Every class should be considered separately and individually and given a different grade according to the closeness of the placings.

(b). In the case of very close pairs, five points should be deducted for a switch. Where the pairs are not so close two points shall be deducted. Where the class is average throughout with no close pairs, the regular out of fifteen points shall be allowed.

(c). In any case where the contestant fails to recognize the close pairs and separates the pair with another individual, the regular out of fifteen points shall be used.

(d). The following method can be used in determining the closeness of the placings. In the case of exhibition classes have the judge in charge make notes on each class indicating if there are any close pairs, and if so whether they are very close or reasonably close. In the case of the production class, the manager of the contest selects someone to rate the production classes, if possible, the same man that places the production classes. If not, the manager of the contest.

C O P Y

November 26, 1923.

2400

Professor H. L. Kempster,
Department of Poultry Husbandry,
University of Missouri,
Columbia, Mo.

Dear Professor Kempster:-

Since the contest at Kansas City I have been going over the different methods of grading discussed. The system that we used at Kansas City proved to be rather hard with those contestants disqualifying rather promiscuously. This worked a very serious handicap, particularly when the wrongly disqualified bird happened to be either first or second as was the case in a number of instances. We did not automatically drop the disqualified bird and figure the placing on the three remaining birds.

The attached sheet shows three methods of grading. (1) The one used at Kansas City, just explained, where 25 points was cut for missing the disqualified bird and not automatically dropped from the placing. (2) This is figured on a basis of 25 points for a disqualified bird but automatically dropping that bird out of consideration and figuring the usual 15 point switch on the remaining bird either two or three. (3) This method was as follows: 20 points cut for each switch where three birds remained in the class, and a 35 point cut for a switch where two birds remained in the class. You will notice that the scores are somewhat different.

I believe after thoroughly considering the three methods that there is only one way that it is possible to measure the contestant's ability as a judge both as to his knowledge of disqualifications and rating of the birds, and that is to have all birds placed regardless of disqualifications and then a penalty of 25 points for a disqualification is sufficient and it does not interfere with the grading of his judging as to the rating of the bird other than the disqualification.

I would like to have you work this out very carefully and be prepared to discuss it at Chicago at the coaches' meeting prior to the contest. I would appreciate your comments, criticisms, and suggestions as soon as possible. I know that I will get them at Chicago, but I would like to have them before so as to work out the nearest perfect grading system.

Very truly yours,

POULTRY HUSBANDRY DEPARTMENT

HAB:W

H. A. Bittenbender, In Charge

Some Reflections From Poultry Judging Contest


L. E. CARD

Professor of Poultry Husbandry

ON Thursday, December 13, 1923, the Fourth Midwest Inter-Collegiate Poultry Judging Contest was held at Chicago, with teams from eight agricultural colleges competing. The final placing of the eight teams was Missouri, Michigan, Ames, Illinois, Wisconsin, Purdue, Kansas and Nebraska. The Illinois team consisting of G. V. Day, D. C. Henderson, R. A. Smith, and E. D. Griffith, alternate, was the only one to make a perfect team score on any class of birds,

other silver trophy offered by the American Poultry School of Kansas City for the high team in exhibition judging were also taken home this year by the boys from Missouri. A Silver cup offered by the American Poultry School for the high man in all-around judging went to C. W. Behrens of Michigan along with a blue ribbon for the same performance. The red and white ribbons for second and third places went respectively to G. V. Day, Illinois, and C. G. Fox,

were judged for egg production, the student's judgment being pitted against the actual trapnest record of the hens. Each man was allowed fifteen minutes in which to judge each class of birds and he had to judge all eight classes in two hours. Only one man was working on a class at any one time, so that six hours was required for the twenty-four men to place all thirty-two birds. A grading committee of four men, working throughout the contest, graded,



every man placing correctly the class of White Leghorn hens judged for egg production. In individual placings G. V. Day '24 was first in exhibition judging and second in the all-around. D. C. Henderson '24 tied for second place in production judging. His placings were exactly like those of C. G. Fox of Missouri. On the toss of a coin Fox won.

The Prizes

At the time of the first contest a \$75.00 silver trophy was donated by the Midwest Poultry and Egg Shippers Association to become the permanent property of the institution first winning it three times. It is offered to the best all-around team and has been won successively by Missouri, Oklahoma, Ames, and Missouri. A beautiful cup offered by the Fleischmann Company for the high team in production judging and an-

Missouri. Gold, silver, and bronze medals donated by Hillview Farm, Beul, Illinois, for the three high men in exhibition judging were won, respectively, by G. V. Day, Illinois, W. Pence, Ames, and M. Hendricks, Kansas. It seemed especially fitting that a gold medal awarded by an Illinois breeder should be won by an Illinois man. Three similar medals offered by The Albert Dickinson Company of Chicago for the three high men in production judging went to C. W. Behrens, Michigan; C. G. Fox, Missouri; and D. C. Henderson, Illinois.

How the Contest Was Run

Each man was required to place eight classes or rings of four birds each. Four of these classes were judged for exhibition or show points according to the American Standard of Perfection. The other four classes

tabulated, and checked the placings as they were turned in so that fifteen minutes after the last class was judged the winners were determined.

No reasons were required for any placing. In the opinion of the writer, reasons have no place in a judging contest. At best they are very difficult to grade, and they usually reflect the teachings of the coach and his individual descriptive vocabulary rather than the contestant's recorded judgment on the class in question. If reasons are to be required they should, in the writer's opinion, be handled as a separate affair. That is, a prize might be offered for the team or individual giving the best reason on selected classes, but reasons should not be used in determining which team did the best judging.

Many persons will not agree with

this point of view, one of the arguments being that oral reasons given by contestants will tend to reduce the number of ties. In the poultry judging contest the matter of ties is handled by a scheme which might very well be adopted for contests in livestock judging. The method is based on the principle of recognizing close pairs. It may easily happen that the top pair in a certain ring is so close that experienced judges will disagree as to which animal should be put up. At the same time the judges will agree that the pair is close. Those in charge of the poultry judging contest believe that a student should not be penalized so heavily for switching a close pair as for switching an ordinary pair. Accordingly, the judge who placed the rings was asked to indicate any close pairs and just how close they were. The contestant's placings were then graded accordingly. To illustrate: Assume a correct placing 1-2-3-4 with 1-2 a very close pair and 2-3, and 3-4 ordinary pairs. A placing of 1-2-4-3 would receive a grade of 85 per cent, i.e., fifteen points cut for switching an ordinary pair. A placing of 2-1-3-4, however, would receive a grade of 95 per cent because switching only a very close pair is better judging than switching an ordinary pair. If, however, the student failed to recognize the close pair and separated the pair by another bird, as 1-3-2-4, the regular cut of fifteen points would apply and the grade would be 85 per cent. Similarly, with 1-2 a very close pair, 2-3 a normal pair and 3-4 a medium close pair, a placing of 2-1-4-3 would be graded 85 per cent instead of the usual 70 per cent.

This method of grading eliminates not only the team ties but most of the individual ties. It makes possible the use of more difficult rings in the

contest without entailing the severe criticism that is sure to arise where a uniform cut for all misplaced animals is applied.

When 1-2 is the close pair the only placings in which grades are different from the usual rating are those in which a 2-1 combination occurs. With one close pair in a ring of four animals there will be six possible combinations so affected. The accompanying table shows the grading method used in the poultry judging contest when 1-2 is a close pair.

Banquet and Inspection Trip

A banquet for all visiting teams and coaches was held at the Auditorium Hotel Thursday evening. The winners were announced at that time. Short talks were given by F. L. Platt, editor of the American Poultry Journal, John H. Robinson, associate editor of the Reliable Poultry Journal, and W. F. Priebe, representing the Midwest Poultry and Egg Shippers. Dr. O. B. Kent of the Quaker Oats Company acted as toastmaster.

On Friday an all day inspection trip was held, with a 100 per cent attendance of all teams and coaches. The students visited the Chicago Poultry Board at the time of "The Call," the Chicago Mercantile Exchange, a warehouse of the Central Cold Storage Company and several poultry and egg dealers. The teams and coaches were guests of the Chicago Chamber of Commerce at the Hamilton Club for lunch and in the afternoon were taken through the manufacturing plant of the Albert Dickinson Company, manufacturers of Globe Feeds.

How Should Judging be Taught?

Coaching a judging team and teaching a course in judging may be quite different problems but some of the same principles ought to underlie

each. Intensive training of a team is likely to, and perhaps should, result in the members of that team emphasizing the same defects and other characteristics of animals judged as their coach. When teaching judging, however, this should not definitely be planned for. In Animal Husbandry 38, Poultry Judging, during the past semester it has been the usual practice to assign a group of three students to a ring or class of four birds. Instead of requiring strictly individual work, the students are encouraged to discuss and compare the birds within a ring, arriving at an agreement as to the correct placing, if possible. Differences in opinion are common at first but as time goes on uniformity becomes the rule rather than the exception. Particularly is this true of the classes in exhibition judging where the ideal type and color are clearly indicated by word and picture in the American Standard Perfection. In judging for egg production the problem is somewhat different owing to the fact that the correct placing is determined by actual trapnest records. The external characteristics of the hens are not always in exact accord with the egg records and especial ability in judging the significance of slight differences in temperament and quality is often the deciding factor.

Reasons have an important place in a judging course because they necessitate a close study of individual specimens. The student is encouraged to study birds rather than to study the instructor. It is only in this way that an instructor, however competent a judge he may be himself, can hope to develop successful self-reliant student judges.

—A—

The farmer who uses his head as well as his hands is the man who makes money while the other fellow places a mortgage on his farm. The starting of a new year is a good time to begin keeping books on things about the place. Make a study of your farm operations; plan ahead. There are a lot of farmers in Illinois who say that is the way to get ahead.

—A—

Cy Adams says: Let him be thankful who counts friends first among his blessings.

—A—

There were some who scoffed until they had been shown, just as there are some who will scoff at modern ideas today until they see results that cannot be denied.

TABLE INDICATING ALL POSSIBLE PLACINGS OF A RING OF FOUR BIRDS WITH CORRESPONDING SCORES WHEN 1-2 IS A VERY CLOSE PAIR, AND 2-3, AND 3-4 ARE ORDINARY PAIRS

PLACING:	SCORE:	PLACING:	SCORE:
1-2-3-4	100	*2-1-3-4	95 (85)
1-2-4-3	85	*2-1-4-3	80 (70)
1-3-2-4	85	2-3-1-4	70
1-3-4-2	70	2-3-4-1	55
1-4-2-3	70	2-4-1-3	55
1-4-3-2	55	2-4-3-1	40
3-1-2-4	70	4-1-2-3	55
3-1-4-2	55	4-1-3-2	40
*3-2-1-4	65 (55)	*4-2-1-3	50 (40)
3-2-4-1	40	4-2-3-1	25
3-4-1-2	40	4-3-1-2	25
*3-4-2-1	35 (25)	*4-3-2-1	10 (0)

(Figures in parentheses indicate the grade given when no pairs are close.)

RULES AND REGULATIONS TO GOVERN THE ANNUAL INTERCOLLEGIATE POULTRY JUDGING CONTEST

The following methods of scoring the student judges' work will be used, four birds constituting a class. For each shift, 15 points will be deducted.

Correct placing 1-2-3-4 -----100%

Examples:

1 2 3 4 -----100	2 1 3 4 -----85
1 2 4 3 ----- 85	2 1 4 3 -----70
1 4 2 3 ----- 70	2 4 1 3 -----55
1 4 3 2 ----- 55	2 4 3 1 -----40
1 3 2 4 ----- 85	2 3 1 4 -----70
1 3 4 2 ----- 70	2 3 4 1 -----55
3 1 2 4 ----- 70	4 1 2 3 -----55
3 1 4 2 ----- 55	4 1 3 2 -----40
3 2 1 4 ----- 55	4 2 3 1 -----25
3 2 4 1 ----- 40	4 2 1 3 -----40
3 4 1 2 ----- 40	4 3 1 2 -----25
3 4 2 1 ----- 25	4 3 2 1 ----- 0

In judging standard classes for disqualifications, 25 points will be deducted for each disqualified bird that is not disqualified and 25 points for birds disqualified that should not be disqualified.

When a bird is not disqualified that should be disqualified or when a bird is disqualified that should not be disqualified deduct 25 points and for each shift that the placing is off, deduct 15 points and add to the 25 points, subtract from 100 which will give you the grade.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT
1923 POULTRY JUDGING CONTEST

Receipts

Balance from H. L. Kempster	\$17.40
Cash from Hillview Farm (for medals)	25.00
" " Albert Dickinson Co. (for medals)	33.70
" " H. A. Bittenbender	10.00
" " L. F. Payne	10.00
" " J. G. Halpin	10.00
" " F. E. Mussehl	10.00
" " E. C. Foreman	10.00
" " L. E. Card	10.00
	\$136.10

1 team cup - Production - Fleischmann Co.
1 " " - Exhibition - American Poultry School
1 individual cup - All-around - American Poultry School

Expenses

Medals	\$47.00
2 gold @ \$15.75	
2 silver @ 4.75	
2 bronze @ 3.00	
Engraving six medals	
408 letters @ \$.05	20.40
Steel die for these and future medals	55.00
9 ribbons @ \$.50	4.50
Postage & insurance	1.20
	\$128.10
Balance on hand	\$ 8.00

judging contest

University of Missouri, Columbia

8

1923

C. G. Fox, R. M. Smith, H. L. Allen
Coach - E. W. Henderson

Michigan Agr. College, E. Lansing

O. W. Belneus, C. Wright, H. Allan
Coach - E. C. Foreman

Iowa State College of Agr., Ames

R. L. Watkins, W. D. Termohlen, W. Pence
Coach - H. A. Bittenbender

Univ. of Illinois, Urbana

H. V. Day, R. A. Smith, D. C. Henderson,
~~E. D. Griffin, alternate~~
Coach - R. E. Card

Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison

E. W. Callenbach, R. B. Pallet, C. F. Everson
Coach - C. E. Paupmann

Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.

E. D. Kochler, E. W. McDonough, R. A. Johnson
Coach - L. H. Schwartz

Kansas State Agr. College, Manhattan

Miss H. Meyers, M. Henrichs, L. Montgomery
Coach - L. F. Payne

Univ. of Nebraska, Lincoln

C. R. Wiegner, E. A. Hatcliff, D. E. Wright
Coach - S. J. Marsden

(3)

The teams are listed in the order of their final placing. Individual placing were as follows;

Exhibition Judging

- 1 - G. V. Day, Illinois
- 2 - W. Pence, Ames
- 3 - M. Henrichs, Kansas

Production Judging

- 1 - O. W. Behrens, Michigan
- 2 - G. Y. Fox, Missouri
- 3 - D. C. Henderson, Illinois

All around

- 1 - O. W. Behrens, Michigan
- 2 - G. V. Day, Illinois
- 3 - G. Y. Fox, Missouri

Report of Meeting of Coaches at
Fourth Annual Judging Contest

17

(Help after
1923 contest)

1. Contest to be held next year same day of week at Colesium Poultry Show, Chicago, Illinois.
2. Man classed as alternate in one contest is not classed as competitor.
3. Students eligible for contest must be enrolled in regular four year Agricultural course.
4. Committee was appointed to plan a method of regular examination for next contest. Report to be made by this committee by March 15. Committee to consist of Professors Payne, Foreman, Marsden.
5. A committee of three appointed on methods of grading, Professor Bittenbender, chairman.
6. Professor Bittenbender's method of grading to be used for 1924 contest.
7. In case of ties in production and exhibition judging a person placing the greatest number of first birds correctly will be the winner. In case of continuation of tie the tie will be broken by person placing the number of last birds correctly. In case of tie still existing, those tying will draw straws. *100 gradation*
8. The grading committee consists of Messrs. Bittenbender, Card, Payne and Foreman.
9. In case there are nine or ten teams entered next year (1924) there will be an additional class of four birds of exhibition Rhode Island Red pullets and an additional class of production White Plymouth Rock hens.
10. For the next year superintendent's charge will be A. G. Philips and person in charge of obtaining prizes, L. E. Card.
11. There was apparently a shortage of funds for financing the 1923 contest. It was agreed that the different institutions represented in the contest would send donations to Dr. L. E. Card to meet this deficit.
12. The banquet following the contest and the inspection trip on the day following the contest are to be made a permanent part of future Judging Contests. For 1924 Mr. O. B. Kent will have charge of the banquet.
13. With the exceptions of the above changes the general rules of the contest will be the same as for 1923.

If any of the above items are incorrect, please advise me so that our record of the meeting of the coaches may be correct.

A. G. Philips
A. G. Philips

Positively All Accounts Due First of Each Month.

STATEMENT

ALBERT WUESTEMAN
JEWELER
CHAMPAIGN, ILLINOIS

Feb 16 1924

192

SOLD TO

MR. Dr L E Card

University of Illinois

Feb 4 1924

Feb	4	2 10 gold medals	15 75	31 50
		2 sterl silver medals	4 75	9 50
		2 bronze med	3 00	6 00
		1 steel die		55 00

102 00

Less credit 25 00 (Suara)

25 00

Balance

77 00

engraveing 408 letters at
5 cents each

20 40

97 40

Keuffeler check 2/19/24

17 40

80 00

Dickinson C. check

33 70

Halperin - Minel's Journal @ 10⁰⁰

46 30

30 00

Payne 10⁰⁰ Bittencourt 10⁰⁰

16 50

20 00

Bel. on hand

370

THE POULTRY JUDGING CONTEST

NAME: Midwest Intercollegiate Poultry Judging Contest

PLACE AND DATE OF CONTEST: Coliseum Poultry Show, Chicago, Illinois, December 13, 1923, beginning at 8:30 a.m. in the annex.

SUPERINTENDENT OF CONTEST: A. G. Philips, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana.

PRIZES: In charge of L. E. Card, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

SELECTION OF BIRDS TO BE JUDGED: In charge of A. G. Philips, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana.

METHODS OF GRADING CONTESTANTS: In charge of H. A. Bittenbender, Ames, Iowa.

CLASSES OF BIRDS TO BE JUDGED: One class each of White Leghorns, Barred Plymouth Rocks, Rhode Island Reds and White Wyandotte yearling hens for Production judging and one class each of White Leghorn cocks, Rhode Island Red cockerels, White Wyandotte pullets and Barred Plymouth Rock pullets for Exhibition judging. There will be four birds in each class.

METHODS OF PLACING AWARDS: The Production hens will be judged from actual trap-nest records for their first year. The Exhibition birds will be judged and placed by a reliable judge who may invite assistance from specialty judges as he desires. His decision on any group in the Exhibition classes will be final. All Exhibition birds will be judged by the American Standard of Perfection.

TIME OF CONTEST: The contest will commence at 8:30 in the morning of the date chosen and 15 minutes will be allowed for judging each class. No intermission will be allowed any contestant and he will judge all classes in two hours.

MEMBERSHIP OF TEAM: There will be three members of each team with one alternate (optional). Membership to this team is open to any student regularly enrolled in the four-year Agricultural course, who has been in attendance at the college he represents for at least one full school year and who at the time of the competition is regularly enrolled in the college where he has completed one year's work and whose work in his classes is of a passing grade. The instructors or coaches in charge of each team shall be responsible for the credentials of that team.

No student is eligible for more than one contest.

Each college sending in a competing team will file with the superintendent of the contest, one week prior to the contest, the names of the coach, the three contestants and the alternate with the class numerals of each. This list may be changed immediately prior to the contest if the college so desires.

METHODS OF JUDGING CONTESTANTS:

There will be no reasons required for any placings made. Disqualifications are to be considered only when judging the exhibition classes. A system or method of grading of contestants will be agreed upon by the coaches in charge of the teams in meeting on the night before the contest.

Each team shall be on hand at a designated place at least 30 minutes prior to the commencing of the contest. The actual supervision of the contest shall be in charge of the superintendent selected by the coaches of the preceding contest. This superintendent shall have charge of the management and the details of the contest and all matters pertaining to it shall be referred to him unless otherwise provided for.

A person shall be selected by the superintendent to be in charge of the contest room during the contest and any contestant desiring to converse or ask questions while judging must appeal to this man.

Each student judge shall be required to write his placings on a blank which shall be provided, the same to be handed to the person in charge of the contestants as soon as the class has been judged. A record blank will bear the contestant's number, the name of the class to be judged and the placings of the birds in the class.

The birds in the Production classes to be judged shall be sent in by a college Poultry Department where authentic trap-nest records have been kept. The birds shall be shipped so as to reach the show at least one full day and probably two, before opening of the judging contest. They shall be cooped in a separate room and in single tiers of coops, so arranged as to obtain the best light possible and provide convenience for the contestants. The egg records of these birds will be mailed in sealed envelopes to the superintendent prior to the contest. The outside of these letters will be marked "Egg Records." They will not be opened until the committee on awards asks for them.

The birds in the Exhibition classes to be judged shall be either taken from unplaced birds in the show room or be shipped in for contest purposes. They will be shipped and placed in a manner similar to birds in the production classes. The birds will be placed by a judge, selected as previously described, prior to the contest, and these placings kept by himself in a sealed envelope until such time as the committee on awards requests them.

The Committee on Awards consisting of four men will be selected by the coaches of the teams competing. Awards will be compiled on the basis of the numbers of the contestants. Appeals on decisions may be made by this committee but the conclusions made at the conclusion of the contest shall be final.

In case of a tie in scores, the decision will be given to the team or individual having the greatest number 100 grades and if the tie still persists, to the greatest number of 85 grades.

To the winning team shall be awarded a \$75 silver trophy to be held by the college they represent for the ensuing year and to become the permanent property of the college winning it for a third time.

To the team with the highest grade in Production judging shall be awarded a \$25.00 silver cup to become the permanent property of the college it represents.

To the winning team in Exhibition judging shall be awarded a \$25.00 silver cup to become the permanent property of the college it represents.

To the individuals ranking first, second and third in Utility judging and to the individuals ranking first, second and third in Exhibition judging shall be awarded gold, silver and bronze medals respectively.

To the individuals ranking first, second and third in judging both the Utility and Exhibition classes shall be awarded suitable inscribed ribbons, blue, red and white in color.

Other prizes may be awarded.

OFFICIAL SCORES AND PLACINGS

4th Intercollegiate Poultry Judging Contest

EXHIBITION

PRODUCTION

No.	Team	Indiv.	2-1-3-4	1-2-4-3	2-4-1-3	1-4-3-2	Indiv	Indiv.	Team	1-2-3-4	4-3-2-1	3-1-4-2	3-4-1-2	Indiv	Indiv.	Team	Indiv	Indiv	Team
	Name	Name	Rocks	Reds	Wyan.	Leg.	Total	Placing	Placing	Rocks	Reds	Wyan.	Leg.	Total	Placing	Placing	grand	Final	Grand
1	MO.	Fox, C. G.	1-2-3-4 95	1-4-3-2 70	2-4-1-3 100	2-4-1-3 50	315	6		3-1-2-4 70	4-3-1-2 85	1-3-4-2 95	3-4-1-2 100	350	2		665	3	
2		Smith, R. M.	1-3-4-2 55	1-4-2-3 95	1-2-4-3 70	4-1-2-3 80	300	10	1	3-1-4-2 55	3-4-2-1 85	1-3-4-2 95	3-4-1-2 100	335	12	1	635	10	1
3		Allen, H. L.	2-1-3-4 100	4-1-3-2 55	4-1-2-3 70	1-3-4-2 90	315	7		1-3-2-4 85	3-4-2-1 85	1-3-4-2 95	4-3-1-2 85	350	4		665	4	1965
		Team	250	220	240	220	930			210	255	285	285	1035					
4		Behrens, O. W.	1-2-3-4 95	1-3-4-2 70	4-1-3-2 55	1-4-3-2 100	320	5		1-2-3-4 100	4-2-1-3 70	1-3-4-2 95	3-1-4-2 90	355	1		675	1	
5	MICH.	Wright, C.	4-1-2-3 50	1-4-2-3 95	3-4-2-1 50	1-4-2-3 85	280	18	5	1-2-3-4 100	4-2-3-1 85	3-1-4-2 100	4-2-3-1 55	340	6	2	620	13	2
6		Allan, G.	3-4-1-2 35	1-4-3-2 70	4-2-1-3 95	1-4-2-3 85	285	15		1-3-4-2 70	4-3-2-1 100	1-3-4-2 95	4-3-2-1 70	335	8		620	13	1915
		Team	180	235	200	270	885			270	255	290	215	1030					
7		Watkins, R. L.	4-2-1-3 55	1-3-2-4 70	2-3-4-1 70	1-3-4-2 90	285	15		2-4-1-3 55	4-3-2-1 100	1-3-4-2 95	3-4-2-1 85	335	8		620	13	
8	AMES	Termohlen, W.D.	4-1-2-3 50	1-4-3-2 70	4-2-3-1 80	1-3-4-2 90	290	13	2	3-1-4-2 55	4-3-1-2 85	1-3-4-2 95	3-4-1-2 100	335	8	4	625	11	3
9		Pence, W.	4-2-3-1 40	1-2-4-3 100	2-4-1-3 100	4-1-3-2 95	335	2		1-4-3-2 55	4-1-3-2 70	3-1-4-2 100	3-4-1-2 100	325	13		660	5	1905
		Team	145	240	250	275	910			165	255	290	285	995					
10		Day, G. V.	1-2-3-4 95	1-4-2-3 95	1-2-4-3 70	1-3-4-2 90	350	1		3-4-1-2 40	3-4-2-1 85	1-3-4-2 95	3-4-1-2 100	320	16		670	2	
11	ILL.	Smith, R. A.	3-4-1-2 35	1-4-2-3 95	4-3-2-1 55	1-4-2-3 85	270	20	3	1-2-4-3 85	4-3-2-1 100	2-1-4-3 25	3-4-1-2 100	310	20	5	580	21	4
12		Henderson, D.C.	4-2-1-3 55	4-1-2-3 70	1-4-2-3 70	1-3-4-2 90	285	15		1-3-4-2 70	3-4-2-1 85	1-3-4-2 95	3-4-1-2 100	350	3		635	9	1885
		Team	185	260	195	265	905			195	270	215	300	980					
13		Callenback, E.W.	2-1-4-3 90	1-2-4-3 100	1-4-3-2 45	1-2-4-3 70	305	8		1-4-3-2 55	4-3-2-1 100	1-3-4-2 95	4-3-1-2 85	335	7		640	8	
14	WISC.	Pallet, R. B.	4-1-3-2 25	1-3-4-2 70	4-3-2-1 55	3-1-4-2 70	220	24	7	1-3-4-2 70	3-4-1-2 70	1-3-4-2 95	3-4-1-2 100	335	8	3	555	23	5
15		Overson, C. F.	4-2-3-1 40	1-4-2-3 95	2-4-3-1 85	1-4-2-3 85	305	9		1-4-3-2 55	4-2-3-1 85	3-1-4-2 100	3-4-1-2 100	340	5		645	7	1840
		Team	155	265	185	225	830			180	225	290	285	1010					
16		Koehler, E.D.	4-2-3-1 40	1-4-3-2 70	1-2-4-3 70	1-4-3-2 100	280	18		1-4-2-3 70	3-4-1-2 70	1-3-4-2 95	3-1-4-2 90	325	15		605	17	
17	PURDUE	McDonough, E.W.	1-4-3-2 45	1-2-3-4 90	4-1-2-3 70	1-3-4-2 90	295	11	6	1-4-3-2 55	3-4-1-2 70	3-1-4-2 100	3-4-1-2 100	325	13	6	620	13	6
18		Johnson, R. A.	2-3-1-4 85	2-3-4-1 45	1-2-4-3 70	4-1-3-2 95	295	11		3-4-1-2 40	4-3-1-2 85	1-3-4-2 95	3-1-4-2 90	310	22		605	17	1830
		Team	170	205	210	285	870			165	225	290	280	960					
19		Myers, Miss H.	1-4-2-3 55	1-4-2-3 95	4-2-3-1 80	1-4-3-2 100	330	4		1-4-3-2 55	3-1-4-2 55	1-3-4-2 95	3-1-4-2 90	295	23		625	11	
20	KAN.	Henrichs, M.	2-4-1-3 70	1-4-3-2 70	2-1-4-3 90	1-4-3-2 100	330	3	4	1-4-3-2 55	3-4-1-2 70	1-3-4-2 95	3-4-1-2 100	320	17	8	650	6	7
21		Montgomery, G.	4-2-1-3 55	1-2-4-3 100	3-4-1-2 25	2-4-1-3 50	230	23		1-4-3-2 55	3-4-1-2 70	1-4-3-2 70	4-1-3-2 70	265	24		495	24	1770
		Team	180	265	195	250	890			165	195	260	260	880					
22		Wieggers, C. R.	3-1-4-2 40	1-4-2-3 95	4-2-1-3 95	4-2-3-1 40	270	20		4-1-2-3 55	4-3-2-1 100	1-3-4-2 95	4-3-2-1 70	320	19		590	20	
23	NEBR.	Hatcliff, E.A.	4-1-2-3 50	1-4-2-3 95	2-4-3-1 85	2-4-3-1 25	255	22	8	1-4-2-3 70	3-4-1-2 70	1-3-4-2 95	3-4-2-1 85	320	18	7	575	22	8
24		Wright, D. E.	4-2-3-1 40	1-2-3-4 90	2-1-4-3 90	4-3-1-2 70	290	13		3-1-4-2 55	4-3-2-1 100	3-4-1-2 85	3-2-4-1 70	310	21		600	19	1765
		Team	130	280	270	135	815			180	270	275	225	950					
25	Total Contest Scores		1395	1970	1745	1955	7065			1530	1950	2195	2135	7810					14875

5th ANNUAL INTERCOLLEGIATE POULTRY JUDGING CONTEST

Chicago, Illinois - December 11, 1924

Institution


Michigan State College
Iowa State College
Purdue University
University of Illinois
University of Missouri
Oklahoma A & M College
Kansas State College
University of Nebraska
Ohio University

Coach

Professor C. G. Card
Professor H. A. Bittenbender
Professor L. H. Schwartz
Professor L. E. Card
Professor E. W. Henderson
Professor R. B. Thompson
Professor H. H. Steup
Professor S. J. Marsdon
Professor R. E. Roberts

Michigan State College Winning Team

Dick Weine; Ralph Meek; Frank Williamson; Clyde Norton; C. G. Card, Coach



Fifth Midwest Intercollegiate

Poultry Judging Contest

1924

Packet Contains:

1. Instructions to coaches from A.G. Phillips, Manager.
2. Methods of grading written examination.
3. Instructions to contestants for written examination.
4. Minutes of meeting of coaches December 11, 1924.
5. Sponsors and financial assistance.
6. List of teams in order of placing and individual winners.
7. Tear sheet from Illinois Agriculturist relative to contest.

Make-up of Contest:

Exhibition Judging - Five four-bird rings

Rhode Island Red Pullets
Rhode Island Red Cockerels
White Wyandotte Pullets
Barred Plymouth Rock Cockerels
White Leghorn Cockerels

Production Judging - Five four-bird rings

Rhode Island Red Yearling Hens
Barred Plymouth Rock Yearling Hens
White Plymouth Rock Yearling Hens
White Wyandotte Yearling Hens
White Leghorn Yearling Hens

Written Examination

Questions on American Standard Perfection

November 21, 1924

TO COACHES OF JUDGING TEAMS:

Information for you:

Date of Judging Contest:

Thursday, December 11, about 8:30 A.M.

Place:

Coliseum Poultry Show.

Classes to be Judged:

Production:

White Leghorns, Rhode Island Reds, Barred Rocks, White Rocks and White Wyandotte Hens. They are to come from Missouri University, Ames, Wisconsin, Illinois and the University of Kentucky.

Exhibition:

Barred Rock Pullets, Rhode Island Red pullets, Rhode Island Red cockerels, White Wyandotte pullets, and White Leghorn cockerels. These are to be obtained from exhibition breeders.

Prizes:

Regular cups as given before for Sweepstakes team, best production team, best exhibition team. Gold, silver and bronze medals for best exhibition individuals, best production individuals and a cup for best all round individual. Special cups or medals will probably be available for best teams judging the different breeds. Cup for Rhode Island Reds already promised.

Banquet:

Banquet will be held for contestants, coaches and a few guests, Thursday night, December 11, at some hotel in charge of Dr. C. B. Kent. Tickets will probably be about \$1.50 each. Some of us will have to pay a little extra to finance the guests.

Inspection Trip:

On Friday the 12th an inspection trip will be as follows:

20959

9:00 to 9:30 -- Poultry Exchange
9:30 to 10:00 -- Mercantile Exchange
10:30 to 11:15 -- Killing and dressing plant.
11:45 to 12:30 -- Illinois Cold Storage.
1:00 to 2:00 -- Luncheon at Swift's dining hall.
2:00 to 3:15 -- Swift's plant.
3:30 to 5:00 -- Darling's plant.

In Charge of Mr. Geo. H. Powers of the U.S. Bureau of Economics. There maybe some changes in details. Plan to have all your men participate in this inspection trip.

Tickets for the Show

Tickets for coach and team will be available in the name of the institution you represent at the ticket window at the Coliseum Show. Advise students against allowing anyone else to use these tickets but themselves.

Mr. L. J. Demberger will have charge of placing the exhibition birds assisted by specialty breeders. Production birds will be judged against actual trapnested records.

This year an additional feature of the contest will be a written examination on the American Standard of Perfection. Questions will be taken from the 100 already in your hands. It is hoped that the answers will be in your hands shortly. The questions for the examination will be chosen by someone who has done college teaching but in no way has any connection with the contest. These questions will be put in my hands and I will have mimeograph sets available for each student. Examination will be taken on day of contest at a time when the student is not judging. An endeavor will be made to ask fair questions, the answers of which will not be mis-interpreted.

My Request to You:

Please meet in my room in the Lexington Hotel at 7:30 Wednesday night, December 10, to go over methods of grading and other detail of the contest. Mail to me by December 1, list of your team members with alternates and the name of the coach. When sending the names of the team members state the school in your institution in which they are regularly enrolled, the class in which they belong, whether or not they are regular or irregular students and whether or not they are passing in all college subjects now being taken. This will enable me to pass on their eligibility in ample time before the contest. Please come prepared to present any questions about the contest at the meeting the night before.

On the night of the contest following the banquet coaches must be available for a meeting at which time plans can be made for the 1926 contest.

Please write me immediately concerning any questions about the contest that are not now well understood by you.

W. H. Powers

8:00 to 8:30 -- Country Exchange
 8:30 to 9:00 -- Mercantile Exchange
 10:00 to 11:15 -- Mining and Smelting plant.
 11:45 to 12:30 -- Illinois Gold Storage.
 1:00 to 2:00 -- Lumberman & Smith's Mining Bull.
 2:00 to 2:15 -- Smith's plant.
 2:30 to 3:00 -- Darling's plant.

Mr. J. J. Hammerger will have charge of placing the exhibition
 items assisted by specially selected. Production items will
 be judged against actual production records.
 There will be some other in detail. Please to have all your men
 participate in this inspection trip.

Tickets for the show

Tickets for coach and train will be available in the name of the
 institution for payment of the ticket window at the following
 show. Advise students against allowing anyone else to use
 these tickets but themselves.

Mr. J. J. Hammerger will have charge of placing the exhibition
 items assisted by specially selected. Production items will
 be judged against actual production records.

This year an additional feature of the contest will be a
 written examination on the American Standard of Perfection.
 Questions will be taken from the 100 already in your hands.
 It is hoped that the answers will be in your hands shortly.
 The questions for the examination will be chosen by someone
 who has done college teaching but in no way has any connection
 with the contest. These questions will be put in my hands
 and I will have a manuscript note available for each student.
 Examination will be taken on day of contest at a time when
 the student is not judging. An answer will be made to ask
 their questions, the answers of which will not be misinterpreted.

My Request to You:

Please meet in my room in the Lexington Hotel at 7:30 Wednesday
 night, December 10, to go over methods of grading and other detail
 of the contest. Tell to me by December 1, list of your team
 members with alternates and the name of the coach. Then sending
 the names of the team members at the school in your institution
 in which they are regularly enrolled. The class in which they be-
 long, whether or not they are regular or irregular students and
 whether or not they are guessing in all college subjects now
 being taken. This will enable me to assess on their eligibility
 in ample time before the contest. Please come prepared to
 present any questions about the contest at the meeting the night
 before.

On the night of the contest following the semester coaches may
 be available for a meeting at which time plans can be made for
 the 1933 contest.

Please write me immediately concerning any questions about the
 contest that are not now well understood by you.

W. J. Hammerger

METHODS OF GRADING
MIDWEST INTERCOLLEGIATE JUDGING CONTEST DEC. 11, 1924.

Method of Grading Written Examination

Philips suggests as follows:- "Four persons be used in grading the examination papers. Man No. 1 would grade question No. 1 and pass it to Man No. 2 and Man No. 3 who would grade the same question. Man No. 4 would have the more experience of the three persons and he would add up the three grades, take the average and give that as the final grade for that question. The grading would be done on the basis of 10 points for each question. Question No. 1 in each group of papers would be corrected first. Question No. 2 would then be graded. After the 25 questions are graded the maximum grade would be 250, which would be divided by 2.5 as the actual grade on the basis of 100 points. This grade would have to be multiplied by $3 \frac{1}{3}$ and added to the total for the judging of the 10 classes."

Using this system of grading and adding to the total score for exhibition and production gives undue weight to final placing of the teams on account of the fact that the written examination covers only exhibition. If the examination is to count one-fourth it would probably be more fair to add the score made on the examination on the basis of 25% to the score on exhibition and not allow it to be placed on production.

The questions as answered, where ^{the} correct according to the Standard and are answered by the student correctly, that student should not be penalized for quoting the Standard correctly. Neither should the student be penalized that answers the question according to the answer sent out.

Method of Grading Exhibition Classes

1. Classes to be made up without disqualified birds.
2. Judges to designate closeness of pairs by allowing five, ten or regular fifteen point cut according to their decision as to closeness of pairs.
3. Regular fifteen point cut to apply where student does not recognize close pairs.

Method of Grading Production Classes

Inasmuch as instructions were sent out that birds should be representative and show a distinctive difference and their eggs records should have approximately 25 eggs difference, the regular fifteen point cut will apply to all switches in production classes.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CONTESTANTS FOR WRITTEN EXAMINATIONS
Midwest Intercollegiate Judging Contest December 11, 1924

1. Contestants should use their number in place of name.
2. Use only one side of sheet of paper.
3. Fold paper lengthwise and on the outside of the upper lefthand corner of each sheet place your number, number of questions answered and sheet number.
4. On inside of sheet place only the number of the questions answered and the sheet number.
5. When examination is finished put all sheets in regular rotation.
6. Either pen or pencil may be used.
7. If corrections are to be made that involve more than a word or so rewrite the sheet.
8. Take plenty of time to write plainly. Do not abbreviate or take for granted that the person correcting your paper can imagine what you mean.
9. If any words can not be readily read same will be considered answered incorrectly.
10. Any evidence of cheating, attempting to defraud, copy or obtain information from any source whatsoever will disqualify you and your team.

MINUTES OF MEETING OF COACHES
December 11, 1924.

The meeting was called to order by Professor Philips immediately following the banquet at the Auditorium Hotel.

As a result of the discussion on the 1924 contest, motions were made and carried as follows:

1. That a similar contest be held in 1925 at the Chicago Coliseum Show.
2. That Professor A. G. Philips act as superintendent of the 1925 contest.
3. That the superintendent appoint all committees for the next contest rather than having them nominated by the group.
4. That the written examination at the next contest be held not earlier than 3 P. M. on the day preceding the contest proper.
5. That there be the following committees appointed.
 - a. Committee on awards.
 - b. Committee on grading answers.
 - c. Committee on prizes.
6. That in the judging contest warnings be given at five minutes and one minute respectively before the end of each period.
7. That colored leg bands be used to identify birds in each class and that a band be put on each coop, the color to correspond with that of the band on the bird belonging in the coop.
8. That the next contest start at 8 A. M.
9. That the banquet following the contest start at 7:30 P. M.
10. That the judge explain his placings on the various classes to the entire group at the end of the contest. In this connection it was suggested that Secretary Hewes make it known to the judge at the time he is hired that this work will be a part of his duties in connection with the show.

L. E. Card
Secretary of the Meeting.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

1924 Poultry Judging Contest

Receipts

Balance from previous year	\$8.00
Cash from Albert Dickinson Co.	33.50
Cash from Collis Products Co.	20.00
Cash from Keyes-Davis Co.	25.00
A.P.A. - 3 medals furnished	<u>\$86.50</u>

Expenses

3 medals and engraving -production	\$33.50
3 medals and engraving -exhibition	33.50
3 silver medals -all around team	14.25
1 gold medal - all around individual	15.75
Engraving 4 medals	11.40
Postage and insurance	1.35
3 ribbon badges	2.25
	<u>\$112.00</u>
Total receipts	86.50
Deficit	<u>\$25.50</u>

THE ILLINOIS AGRICULTURIST

Established 1896

MEMBER AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE MAGAZINES ASSOCIATED

JOHN H. GODDARD, '25.....*Editor in Chief*
 CHESTER R. POWELL, '26.....*Business Manager*
 RUSSELL D. WILEY, '26.....*Circulation Manager*

EDITORIAL STAFF

T. Bullman, '25.....*Chief Departmental Editor*
 Eva E. Oathout, '25.....*Home Economics Editor*
 J. L. Baker, '26.....*Alumni Notes*
 M. P. Catherwood, '26.....*Exchange Bureau*
 R. R. Tombaugh, '26.....*Agricultural Extension*
 C. L. Crawford, '26.....*Illini Aggravator*
 P. L. Trovillion, R. L. Ash, F. A. Embrey, D. V. Duncan,
 J. W. Schaff, J. L. Sconce, R. C. Kohler

BUSINESS STAFF

G. S. Randall, T. Funk, P. A. Funk, E. R. Garrison, C. A. Bell, A. D. Corzine, L. G. Stitt, F. L. Robison, S. H. Ambrose
 E. L. Berleman, R. S. Hettick, J. L. Fay, W. N. Smith

Published by the Illini Publishing Company. Entered as second class matter at the postoffice at Urbana, Illinois.

Subscription price per year, \$1.50. Single copies, 25 cents.

Address all mail to *Illinois Agriculturist, Urbana, Illinois.*

THE SENIOR'S PROBLEM

The beginning of the second semester marks the start of a critical period for seniors in the College of Agriculture. After nearly four years of comparatively sheltered college life they are called upon to choose an occupation and to find an opening in that occupation for themselves. Fortunate indeed are those among us who can go back to their home farms and step into partial or complete management of the old homestead. At least, that is the way it seems to the rest of us who must fight for a chance to break into the business world of agriculture or commerce.

The men who expect to continue in college with graduate training are not immediately concerned with obtaining outside employment. It is those who must seek work in the general field of agriculture who are confronted with the most serious problem. The college man is proverbially undecided as to the definite line of work in which he wishes to take up his life occupation. If he has specialized in a particular field, he frequently finds that field overcrowded and must seek elsewhere. The specialist should, of course, look first in his specialty. Prospective teachers of vocational agriculture are in one of the most favorable positions to become acquainted with openings in their field. The college is looked upon as one of the main central sources of such material.

The young college man is frequently at a loss as to how to go about securing a suitable position after graduation. The best advice which has been given is to start looking early. We have more time and opportunity to look around while in college than after we leave. Faculty men and alumni can and will give all the assistance in their power.

THE AG OBSERVATION POST

The Little International livestock show which was a feature of Farmers' Week not only fulfilled its functions as an entertainment for visitors of the week and as the annual local exhibit of University purebreds, but it also unified student effort in a worthy and beneficial enterprise. There is no better college experience to be gained than in the management and staging of such a show.

The souvenir cover for the June issue of the *Agriculturist* which will show the signatures of all the graduating class of 1925 will furnish a good log book for the class and a souvenir of the year for all Ag students. Campus and faculty pictures which will be included with other "year book" material will make the magazine a form of Ag annual.

The beginning of the second semester is a good time to consider again the proposition of combining some of the weaker clubs of the college in with the larger clubs.

We welcome Prof. W. E. Carroll, new chief of the swine division of the College of Agriculture, who has come to this college from the animal husbandry department of the University of Utah. With the new swine plant well along in construction we look forward to a new period of activity in swine work.

That the tendency of farmers is to give more and more attention to the business side of farming was recognized in our recent Farmers' Week when this subject was given a prominent place on the program. Discussions of farm business topics occupied the whole of the first afternoon of the meeting.

Crop production in the United States is not keeping pace with the annual increase in population according to figures recently released by the United States Department of Agriculture. Total crop production has increased thirteen percent during the past twelve years, but production per capita has decreased about five percent. This ought to be some encouragement to prospective farmers.

The question of freight transportation on our rivers, lakes, and other waterways has been rather overlooked since the recent cessation of the agitation for a deep water outlet from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic. It is a question which will still bear debate.

A decrease of about 440,000,000 bushels of wheat in the world wheat crop for last year, and a decrease of about thirty percent in the number of sows farrowing in the fall of 1924 are indicators of the general situation in agricultural production.

Individual winners were as follows:

Exhibition judging

1. J. D. Springer, Ames
2. V. R. Urey, Illinois
3. F. H. Williamson, Michigan

Production judging

1. C. E. Norton, Michigan
2. R. Meek, Michigan
3. J. Rosenbaum, Purdue

Written examinations

1. J. Rosenbaum, Purdue
2. C. C. Cobb, Ames
3. J. D. Springer, Ames

all around

- 1 - J. D. Springer, Ames
- 2 - W. W. Stark, Missouri
- 3 - F. H. Williamson, Michigan

Poultry Judging Teams in Order of Final Placing

Michigan

C. E. Norton, F. H. Williamson, R. Mueh
C. G. Card, Coach

Minnesota

F. E. Misa, C. C. Cobb, J. D. Springer
H. A. Bittenbender, Coach

Purdue

R. W. Prange, H. Pease, J. Rosenbaum
L. H. Schwartz, Coach

Illinois

M. Henderson, O. C. Holt, V. R. Urey
L. E. Card, Coach

Missouri

T. Trimble, W. W. Stark, L. G. Neel
E. W. Henderson, Coach

Oklahoma

B. D. McWhorter, H. S. Ware, H. Aurell
R. B. Thompson, Coach

Kansas

H. A. Stewart, S. Caton, W. J. Kraus
H. H. Stump, Coach

Nebraska

E. C. Woodrick, G. V. Jones, E. Murphy
L. J. Marsden, Coach

Ohio

C. B. Alsop, D. B. Baker, R. W. Zimmerman
R. E. Roberts, Coach

POULTRY JUDGING TEAMS IN ORDER OF FINAL PLACING

MICHIGAN

C. E. Norton, F. H. Williamson, R. Meek
C. G. Card, Coach

AMES

F. E. Mixa, C. C. Cobb, J. D. Springer
H. A. Bittenbender, Coach

PURDUE

R. W. Prange, H. Pease, J. Rosenbaum
L. H. Schwartz, Coach

ILLINOIS

M. Henderson, O. C. Holt, V. R. Usrey
L. E. Card, Coach

MISSOURI

T. Trimble, W. W. Stark, L. G. Neel
E. W. Henderson, Coach

OKLAHOMA

B. D. McWhorter, H. G. Ware, H. Aurell
R. B. Thompson, Coach

KANSAS

H. A. Stewart, S. Caton, W. J. Kraus
H. H. Steup, Coach

NEBRASKA

E. C. Woodrick, G. V. Jones, E. Murphy
S. J. Marsden, Coach

OHIO

C. B. Alspach, D. B. Baker, R. W. Zimmerman
R. E. Roberts, Coach

OFFICIAL SCORES AND PLACINGS
5th INTERCOLLEGIATE POULTRY JUDGING CONTEST

R. E. Gard
1924

			EXHIBITION					PRODUCTION													
Correct Placing			5 10 4-1-3-2	5 10 1-4-3-2	5 5 4-2-1-3	10 10 3-1-4-2	5 3-2-4-1			2-3-1-4	4-3-1-2	1-4-3-2	1-3-4-2	2-4-1-3							
Team	No.	Name of Individual	Red Pullets	B.P.R. Pullets	Leghorn Cocks.	Red Cocks.	Wyan. Pullets	Total Score	Plac- ing	R.I. Reds	B. P. Rocks	W. P. Rocks	White Wyan.	White Leghorn	Total Score	Plac- ing	Written Exam	Indiv. Grand Total	Final Place		
Ames	1	Mixa, F. E.	4-1-2-3 85	3-1-4-2 70	4-1-3-2 70	3-1-4-2 100	4-1-3-2 40	365	6	2-3-4-1 85	4-3-1-2 100	2-4-1-3 40	1-3-2-4 85	4-2-1-3 85	395	16	323.2	1083.2	9		
	2	Cobb, C. C.	1-2-4-3 55	3-4-1-2 70	4-1-3-2 70	3-4-2-1 70	4-1-3-2 40	305	21	2-3-1-4 100	2-4-3-1 55	4-1-2-3 70	1-3-4-2 100	4-2-1-3 85	410	11	332.4 ^②	1047.4	13		
	3	Springer, J.D.	1-4-3-2 95	1-2-3-4 60	4-1-2-3 95	3-1-2-4 85	4-3-1-2 55	390	1	2-3-4-1 85	4-3-2-1 85	4-1-3-2 85	3-1-4-2 85	4-2-1-3 85	425	10	331.1 ^③	1146.1	1		
		Team	235	200	235	255	135	1060	1	270	240	195	270	255	1230	5	986.7 ^④	3276.7	2		
Ohio	4	Alspach, C. B.	1-3-4-2 70	4-3-1-2 70	1-2-3-4 50	2-3-4-1 45	1-2-3-4 50	285	24	3-2-1-4 85	4-3-2-1 85	1-3-2-4 70	1-2-3-4 70	2-4-3-1 85	395	17	276.6	956.6	23		
	5	Baker, D. B.	3-4-1-2 70	3-2-4-1 35	3-4-2-1 55	2-4-3-1 25	2-1-3-4 55	240	27	3-2-1-4 85	3-4-1-2 85	1-4-3-2 100	1-3-2-4 85	4-3-2-1 55	410	13	308.0	958.0	22		
	6	Zimmerman, R.W.	3-1-4-2 70	3-4-2-1 45	4-1-2-3 95	4-2-1-3 30	3-4-2-1 85	325	13	2-3-1-4 100	3-2-4-1 55	4-1-2-3 70	3-1-4-2 85	3-1-2-4 25	335	26	296.4	956.4	25		
		Team	210	150	200	100	190	850	9	270	225	240	240	165	1140	7	881.0 ^①	2871.0	9		
Mo.	7	Trimble, T.	4-1-2-3 85	2-3-1-4 25	1-2-4-3 75	2-3-1-4 55	4-2-1-3 40	280	25	2-3-1-4 100	4-3-1-2 100	3-4-2-1 40	3-1-4-2 85	1-2-4-3 70	395	15	307.4	982.4	19		
	8	Stark, W. W.	4-1-2-3 85	4-1-3-2 95	2-1-4-3 70	2-3-1-4 55	2-4-1-3 70	375	5	2-3-1-4 100	4-2-1-3 55	4-1-3-2 85	1-3-4-2 100	2-4-1-3 100	440	6	330.2	1145.2	2		
	9	Neal, L. G.	4-1-2-3 85	2-3-4-1 15	2-4-1-3 95	3-4-2-1 70	4-1-2-3 35	300	22	2-3-1-4 100	4-3-2-1 85	4-1-3-2 85	3-1-4-2 85	2-4-1-3 100	455	4	316.6	1071.6	11		
		Team	255	135	240	180	145	955	8	300	240	210	270	270	1290	3	954.2 ^④	3199.2	5		
Purdue	10	Prange, R. W.	1-4-2-3 80	4-3-1-2 70	2-1-4-3 70	1-2-3-4 55	4-3-1-2 55	330	12	2-3-4-1 85	4-2-3-1 70	1-4-3-2 100	1-3-4-2 100	2-4-3-1 85	440	8	317.3	1087.3	8		
	11	Pease, H.	4-1-2-3 85	3-1-4-2 70	2-1-3-4 55	3-2-4-1 60	4-3-1-2 55	325	16	2-3-4-1 85	4-3-2-1 85	1-4-2-3 85	3-1-4-2 85	4-2-3-1 70	410	14	314.4	1049.4	12		
	12	Rosenbaum, J.	4-1-3-2 100	4-2-3-1 40	2-1-4-3 70	1-4-3-2 70	4-2-1-3 40	320	17	2-3-1-4 100	4-3-2-1 85	1-4-3-2 100	1-3-4-2 100	4-2-1-3 85	470	3	333.3 ^①	1123.3	4		
		Team	265	180	195	185	150	975	5	270	240	285	285	240	1320	2	965.0 ^②	3260.0	3		
Mich.	13	Norton, C. E.	1-3-4-2 70	1-2-3-4 60	1-2-4-3 75	3-2-4-1 60	2-1-3-4 55	320	19	3-2-1-4 85	4-3-1-2 100	1-4-3-2 100	1-3-4-2 100	2-4-1-3 100	485	1	308.1	1113.1	5		
	14	Williamson, F.H.	4-1-2-3 85	1-4-2-3 85	2-1-4-3 70	3-2-1-4 70	4-3-2-1 70	380	3	2-3-1-4 100	3-4-1-2 85	1-4-3-2 100	3-1-4-2 85	4-2-1-3 85	455	5	290.8	1125.8	3		
	15	Meek, R.	1-4-2-3 80	1-2-4-3 70	2-1-4-3 70	3-4-2-1 70	4-3-1-2 55	345	9	2-3-1-4 100	4-3-1-2 100	4-3-1-2 70	1-3-4-2 100	2-4-1-3 100	470	2	282.8	1097.8	6		
		Team	235	215	215	200	180	1045	2	285	285	270	285	285	1410	1	881.7 ^④	3336.7	1		
Okla.	16	McWhorter, B.D.	4-1-2-3 85	2-3-1-4 25	2-4-1-3 95	1-3-2-4 75	1-2-3-4 50	330	11	1-4-2-3 40	4-3-1-2 100	3-1-2-4 55	3-1-4-2 85	1-2-4-3 70	350	23	330.8	1010.8	18		
	17	Ware, H. G.	4-1-3-2 100	1-3-4-2 90	1-2-3-4 50	2-4-3-1 25	4-3-2-1 70	335	10	1-2-4-3 55	4-3-1-2 100	3-2-1-4 40	1-4-3-2 85	4-2-1-3 85	365	21	282.2	982.2	20		
	18	Aurell, H.	4-1-2-3 85	1-3-4-2 90	1-2-3-4 50	3-4-2-1 70	4-3-2-1 70	365	7	1-2-4-3 55	4-3-1-2 100	4-3-1-2 70	4-3-1-2 55	1-2-4-3 70	350	24	332.0	1047.0	14		
		Team	270	205	195	170	190	1030	3	150	300	165	225	225	1065	8	945.0 ^⑤	3040.0	6		
Ill.	19	Henderson, M.	1-4-3-2 95	1-2-3-4 60	4-1-3-2 70	2-3-4-1 45	2-1-3-4 55	325	14	2-3-1-4 100	4-3-1-2 100	4-1-3-2 85	1-3-4-2 100	4-3-2-1 55	440	7	325.5	1090.5	7		
	20	Holt, O. C.	1-3-4-2 70	2-1-3-4 45	1-2-4-3 75	3-2-1-4 70	2-1-3-4 55	315	20	2-3-1-4 100	4-3-2-1 85	1-4-2-3 85	3-1-4-2 85	1-2-3-4 55	410	12	313.3	1038.3	17		
	21	Usrey, V. R.	4-1-3-2 100	3-1-4-2 70	2-1-4-3 70	3-2-4-1 60	2-3-1-4 80	380	2	2-3-1-4 100	3-4-1-2 85	4-3-2-1 55	3-1-4-2 85	3-2-4-1 55	380	19	316.3	1076.3	10		
		Team	265	175	215	175	190	1020	4	300	270	225	270	165	1230	4	955.1 ^③	3205.1	4		
Nebr.	22	Woodrick, E. C.	4-1-2-3 85	2-3-1-4 25	1-4-3-2 55	3-1-2-4 85	2-3-4-1 95	345	8	3-1-4-2 55	4-3-1-2 100	1-3-4-2 85	3-4-2-1 55	4-2-1-3 85	380	18	227.0	952.0	26		
	23	Jones, G. V.	4-1-2-3 85	3-2-1-4 40	2-1-4-3 70	3-2-4-1 60	3-4-1-2 70	325	15	3-1-4-2 55	4-3-1-2 100	3-1-4-2 70	3-1-2-4 70	4-3-1-2 40	335	27	318.6	978.6	21		
	24	Murphy, E.	4-1-2-3 85	3-2-1-4 40	3-1-2-4 20	3-2-4-1 60	3-2-1-4 85	290	23	3-2-4-1 70	4-1-2-3 70	4-1-2-3 70	3-4-1-2 70	1-2-4-3 70	350	25	316.5	956.5	24		
		Team	255	105	145	205	250	960	7	180	270	225	195	195	1065	9	862.1 ^④	2887.1	8		
Kans.	25	Stewart, H.A.	4-1-2-3 85	3-1-4-2 70	2-1-4-3 70	3-1-2-4 85	4-3-2-1 70	380	4	2-3-4-1 85	2-4-3-1 55	1-2-4-3 70	3-4-1-2 70	4-2-1-3 85	365	22	295.4 ^①	1040.4	16		
	26	Caton, S.	4-2-1-3 70	2-1-3-4 45	2-1-4-3 70	3-2-4-1 60	1-2-4-3 25	270	26	2-3-4-1 85	4-2-3-1 70	1-4-3-2 100	3-2-1-4 55	1-2-4-3 70	380	20	289.3	939.3	27		
	27	Kraus, W. J.	4-2-1-3 70	4-2-1-3 55	2-1-3-4 55	3-1-2-4 85	2-1-3-4 55	320	18	2-3-4-1 85	4-2-3-1 70	1-4-3-2 100	3-1-4-2 85	2-4-1-3 100	440	9	282.8	1042.8	15		
		Team	225	170	195	230	150	970	6	255	195	270	210	255	1185	6	867.5 ^④	3022.5	7		
Totals			2215	1535	1835	1700	1580			2280	2265	2085	2250	2055							

6th ANNUAL INTERCOLLEGIATE POULTRY JUDGING CONTEST

Chicago, Illinois - December 10, 1925

Institution

Purdue University
Iowa State College
Oklahoma A & M College
Ohio State University
Michigan State College
University of Illinois
University of Missouri
Kansas State Agr. College
University of Wisconsin
University of Nebraska

Coach

Professor L. H. Schwartz
Professor H. A. Bittenbender
Professor R. B. Thompson
Professor E. L. Dakan
Professor C. G. Card
Professor D. C. Henderson
Professor E. W. Henderson
Professor H. H. Steup
Professor C. E. Lampman
Professor S. J. Marsden

Purdue University Winning Team

Prof. C. H. Schwartz, Coach; F. E. Christen; C. F. Heller; J. C. Walters;
I. S. Huang



Sixth Midwest Intercollegiate

Poultry Judging Contest

1925

Packet contains:

1. Minutes of coaches meeting - Wednesday Dec. 9, 1925
2. List of examination questions with the answers and letters to coaches from H. H. Steupp, Kansas State College, Chairman of examination committee.
3. Tear sheet from Illinois Agriculturist.
4. List of teams in order of placing.
5. Sponsors and financial statement.

Make-up of Contest:

Exhibition Judging - Five four-bird rings

White Leghorn Cockerels
Rhode Island Red Pullets
Rhode Island Red Cockerels
Barred Plymouth Rock Pullets
White Wyandotte Pullets

Production Judging - Five four-bird rings

Rhode Island Red Yearling Hens
Barred Plymouth Rock Yearling Hens
White Plymouth Rock Yearling Hens
White Wyandotte Yearling Hens
White Leghorn Yearling Hens

Written Examination -

Questions on the American Standard of Perfection

Minutes, Meeting of Coaches at Judging Contest

Wednesday, December 9, 1925

It is recommended that in the future cash prizes be distributed on an individual rather than a team basis if found to be practicable.

Moved that if there be eleven or more teams in the Judging Contest, there should be two additional classes for judging consisting of Buff Orpingtons, production and exhibition.

Moved that the Exhibition classes should consist of three groups of males and three groups of females.

Moved that for the 1926 contest the questions in the written examination be similar to the type ²~~2~~ questions used this year. These questions should be limited in their scope and from the Standard of Perfection only.

Moved that a committee be appointed to limit the scope of the questions for the written examination.

Moved that the valuations for the contest grades remain as they now are.

KANSAS STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE
MANHATTAN, KANSAS.
DEPARTMENT OF POULTRY HUSBANDRY

July 28, 1925.

To the Coaches of the Poultry
Judging Teams:

The committee on the examination to be held this year at the Chicago Judging Contest is enclosing herewith the new list of questions which they have formulated. You will find these questions different from those used last year. There are three types of questions on this year's examination, the first being the same as we used last year but not so many in number since all objectionable questions were eliminated. We have also eliminated from this type everything concerning disqualifications, and have substituted Section II in their place. Section III deals with utility judging entirely. The examination will consist of 10 questions from Section I, 25 from Section II, and 10 from Section III.

We understand that there may be some objections to some of these changes, but since this examination is still a new proposition, we decided to give this a try-out this year, and make any changes that our experience leads us to think proper.

The answers to these questions are also enclosed, and we would appreciate it if you would go over these to verify the correction of them. Any changes that you deem necessary should be given to the chairman of the examination committee at the convention meeting in Manhattan in August.

If there are enough objections, we could arrange for a meeting of the coaches to discuss and go over alterations with as many as are present at the convention.

Very truly yours,

H. H. Steup

Chairman of Examination Committee.

HHS/DOF
ENCLOSURES.

KANSAS STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE
MANHATTAN, KANSAS
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL ECONOMY

July 25, 1925

To the Coaches of the Faculty
Looking Forward

The committee on the examination to be held this year of the change being content in enclosing herewith the new list of questions which they have formulated. You will find these questions different from those used last year. There are three types of questions on this year's examination, the first being the same as we used last year but not so many in number since all objective questions were eliminated. We have also eliminated from this type everything concerning disquisitions, and have substituted section II in their place. Section III deals with policy making entirely. The examination will consist of 10 questions from section I, 25 from section II, and 10 from section III.

We understand that there may be some objections to some of these changes, but since this examination is still a new experiment, we decided to give this a try-out this year and make any changes that our experience leads us to think proper.

The answers to these questions are also enclosed. And we would appreciate it if you would go over them to verify the correctness of them. Any changes that you deem necessary should be given to the chairman of the examination committee at the convention meeting in Manhattan in August.

If there are enough objections, we could arrange for a meeting of the coaches to discuss and go over objections with as many as are present at the convention.

Very truly yours,

H. H. Steph

Chairman of Examination Committee

Enclosed

Study Questions Compiled for Student Poultry Judges.

Section I.

Based on The American Standard of Perfection.

Examination will contain 10 questions from this section.

1. What is meant by 'class' 'breed' and 'variety'? Describe fully.
2. What is meant by the "scale of Points" and for what purpose are they used?
3. Is there any difference between a parti-colored and a solid-colored fowl?
4. Which would you consider the most important in judging a show, 'shape' or 'color'? Give a positive reason for your answer.
5. Would you handle every specimen in the show regardless of their quality or only just handle those that looked as if they might stand a chance to win? Why?
6. How would you determine in the show room whether a specimen was pure bred or not?
7. You are instructed in the Standard to make deductions from the score for under weight in certain varieties. How much would you deduct per pound in all varieties?
8. Are there any specimens that you would discount for overweight? If so, name all the breeds that you would discount for overweight.
9. When judging a show, would you require the specimens to be weighed? If not, state reasons why.
10. Name all the varieties in the Standard that are Barred.
11. What are the highest valued sections in the Scale of Points for a Plymouth Rock?
12. If you had a Barred Rock cockerel weighing 7 1/2 lbs. and a Barred Rock pullet weighing 7 lbs. both tied in score for highest scoring Barred Rock which would you award the prize, and why?
13. What premiums would you offer the following assuming each was the highest scoring specimens in the class: Light Brahma cock scoring 88 points? Buff Orpington cockerel scoring 89 points? R.I.Red hen scoring 87 points? Barred Rock pullet scoring 87 points?
14. If two cockerels of the same variety scored the same and weighed the same, how would you decide the tie?
15. Is there any difference between "Mealiness" and "Mossiness"?
16. Do any two 'breeds' in the Standard have the same "scale of points"?

Section I

Based on The American Standard of Perfection.

Examination will contain 10 questions from this section.

1. What is meant by 'class', 'breed', and 'variety'? Describe fully.
2. What is meant by the "scale of points" and for what purpose are they used?
3. Is there any difference between a parti-colored and a solid-colored foal?
4. Which would you consider the most important in judging a show, 'shape', or 'color'? Give a positive reason for your answer.
5. Would you handle every specimen in the show regardless of their quality or only just handle those that looked as if they might stand a chance to win? Why?
6. How would you determine in the show room whether a specimen was pure bred or not?
7. You are instructed in the standard to make deductions from the score for under weight in certain varieties. How much would you deduct per pound in all varieties?
8. Are there any specimens that you would discount for overweight? If so, name all the breeds that you would discount for overweight.
9. When judging a show, would you require the specimens to be weighed? If not, state reasons why.
10. Name all the varieties in the standard that are listed.
11. What are the highest valued sections in the scale of points for a Plymouth Rock?
12. If you had a Barred Rock cockerel weighing $7\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. and a Barred Rock pullet weighing 7 lbs. both tied in score for highest scoring Barred Rock which would you award the prize, and why?
13. What specimens would you enter the following assuming each was the highest scoring specimen in the class: Light Brahma cock scoring 85 points; Buff Orpington cockerel scoring 82 points; R.I. Red hen scoring 87 points; Barred Rock pullet scoring 87 points?
14. If two cockerels of the same variety scored the same and weighed the same, how would you decide the tie?
15. Is there any difference between "Hollander" and "Kosher"? If so, name the difference.
16. Do any two 'breeds' in the standard have the same "scale of points"?

17. Should there be any difference in the combs of a Rose Comb R.I.Red and a Wyandotte? If so, describe them.
18. How would you tell the difference between a R.I.Red and a Buckeye?
19. Are there many black varieties of fowls that should have yellow shanks or yellow feet? If so, name them all.
20. What would you do in the show room with a specimen on which "scaly-leg" had destroyed the natural color?
21. Are there any breeds in the Standard in which the male is required to be "hen-feathered?" If so, what breed or breeds?
22. Some breeds have Crests, some have Beards, and some have Muffs. Is there any breed or breeds in the Standard that should have all three? If so, name the breed or breeds.
23. How much would you discount the following for weight? R.I.Red cock weighing 6 lbs; Buff Orpington cockerel weighing 8 lbs; White Leghorn pullet weighing 2 1/2 lbs; Dark Cornish cock weighing 9 3/4 lbs?
24. Is there any difference in the weights of Leghorns and Anconas?
25. Name all the breeds and varieties in the American Class.
26. Is there any difference in the breast color of a Silver Laced Wyandotte male and a Silver Penciled Rock male? If so, what is the difference?
27. What is the Standard color of legs and toes on the following: Black Minorcas? Black Leghorns? Black Wyandottes? Anconas?
28. Give standard weights of Plymouth Rocks.
29. Give standard weights of Wyandottes.
30. Give standard weights of Orpingtons.
31. Give standard weights of Leghorns.
32. Give standard weights of Rhode Island Reds.
33. Give standard weights of Minorcas.
34. Give standard weights of Light Brahmas.
35. What is the difference in the penciling of a Partridge Wyandotte and a Partridge Rock?
36. Name the different kinds of combs found in the American class.
37. How many kinds of combs do you find in the English class? Name them.
38. There is a provision in the Scale of Points for 'condition'. Mention four things that you would cut a specimen for on 'condition'.

17. Should there be any difference in the comb of a Rose Comb N.I. Red and a Wyandotte? If so, describe them.
18. How would you tell the difference between a N.I. Red and a Bantam?
19. Are there any black varieties of fowls that should have yellow shanks or yellow feet? If so, name them all.
20. What would you do in the show room with a specimen on which "sally-leg" had destroyed the natural color?
21. Are there any breeds in the standard in which the male is required to be "hen-feathered"? If so, what breed or breeds?
22. Some breeds have Crests, some have Beards, and some have tails. Is there any breed or breeds in the standard that should have all three? If so, name the breed or breeds.
23. How much would you discount the following for weight? N.I. Red cock weighing 6 lbs; Buff Orpington cockerel weighing 8 lbs; White Leghorn pullet weighing 2 1/2 lbs; Dark Gamecock cock weighing 2 3/4 lbs?
24. Is there any difference in the weight of Leghorns and Anconas?
25. Name all the breeds and varieties in the American class.
26. Is there any difference in the breast color of a Silver Laced Wyandotte male and a Silver Penedra cock male? If so, what is the difference?
27. What is the standard color of legs and toes on the following: Black Minorca? Black Leghorn? Black Wyandotte? Ancona?
28. Give standard weight of Plymouth Rocks.
29. Give standard weight of Wyandottes.
30. Give standard weight of Orpingtons.
31. Give standard weight of Leghorns.
32. Give standard weight of Rhode Island Reds.
33. Give standard weight of Minorcas.
34. Give standard weight of Light Brahas.
35. What is the difference in the pencilling of a Partridge Wyandotte and a Partridge Rock?
36. Name the different kinds of combs found in the American class.
37. How many kinds of combs do you find in the English class? Name them.
38. There is a provision in the Book of Points for "condition." Mention four things that you would cut a specimen for on "condition."

39. If two cockerels of the same variety scored the same and weighed the same how would you decide the tie?
40. You have two Wyandotte Cockerels, one weighing 9 lbs. and the other 7 lbs. which one wins, and why?
41. If you had a R.I.Red wing that you considered one-eighth deficient in color of fronts, wing bows and wing bars, one-fourth on primaries and one-half on secondaries, what would be the total cut on that wing for color?
42. State approximately the discount you would make on tail shape of males in the following varieties on tail carried at 70 degrees. Plymouth Rocks; Wyandottes; Rhode Island Reds; and White Leghorns.
43. Barred Plymouth Rocks are sometimes called Dominiques? Is this correct or is there any difference between them? If any difference, describe fully.
44. In judging Buff varieties which do you prefer, a light or lemon colored Buff, a dark or cinnamon color, or a medium shade? State reason for your preference.
45. What is meant by the term "peppering"?
46. Name all the varieties in which "peppering" might be found.
47. Are there any "scale of Points" in which the term 'stern' is used. If so, name them.
48. Sometimes the word 'station' is used in speaking of fowls? What breed or breeds is that term used in connection with?
49. Are there any breeds in the Standard that do not have a weight clause applied to them. If so, name them.
50. What are 'carnacles' and on what breeds are they found?
51. Are there any "scale of Points" in the Standard in which 'Symmetry' is not used. If so, name them.
52. On what grounds may an exhibitor protest your awards?
53. Name breeds and varieties in Mediterranean class.
54. Name breeds and varieties in English class.

40. You have two Synchotis hookeri, one weighing 9 lbs. and the other 7 lbs. which one wine, and why?

45. If you had a K.I. Red wing that you considered one-tenth deficient in color of front, what would be the total and on that wing for color? In color of front, what would be the total and on that wing for color? What would be the total and on that wing for color?

42. State approximately the elevation you would make on tall ships of
males in the following varieties on tall oriented at 70 degrees.
Plymouth Rock; Wyandott; Rhode Island Red; and White Leghorns.

45. Banned 15-month books are sometimes called "banned" in this context or is there any difference between them? If any difference describe fully.

42. What is meant by the term "reporting?"

46. Name all the varieties in which "popping" might be found.

47. Are there any "scale of points" in which the term "reform" is used. If so, name them.

43. Sometimes the word 'station' is used in speaking of lower grades or periods in the same way as the word 'station' is used in connection with the word 'station'.

49. Are there any breeds in the standard that do not have a weight figure applied to them. If so, name them.

FD. What are 'normalies' and on what needs are they based?

21. Are there any "scale of points" in the standard in which "symmetry" is not used. If so, name them.

52. On what grounds may an exhibitor protest your award?

57. Neue Proben und Variationen in Modifikationen eines.

44. Name breeds and varieties in English class.

Section II.

Based on a practical application of all disqualifications listed in The American Standard of Perfection.

The 10 questions listed here are samples. The examination will contain 25 such questions compiled by a noninterested party, and covering each and any disqualification of chickens, ducks, geese and turkeys listed in the Standard of Perfection.

Answer by checking (x) the column referring to correct interpretation of the conditions mentioned.

	Defects	Disqualifications	Neither
1.	White shanks on Barred Plymouth Rock.		
2.	White in main-tail feathers of Partridge Cochin.		
3.	Two spikes on Wyandotte comb.		
4.	Black beak on Black Minorcas.		
5.	Japanese Bantam with squirrel tail.		
6.	Twisted wing in Toulouse geese.		
7.	Middle toe of Black Langshan feathered.		
8.	Reddish bay eye in Buff Orpington		
9.	Black feather on back of Columbian Wyandotte.		
10.	Eye absent in Dark Cornish.		

Section II.

Based on a practical application of all characteristics listed in the list of characters of the species.

The 10 questions listed here are examples. The examination will contain 25 such questions suggested by a standardized party, and covering each and every characteristic of characters, habits, colors and features listed in the Standard of Variation.

Answer by checking (x) the column referring to correct interpretation of the conditions mentioned.

- | | Disqualifications, Points | Below |
|-----|--|-------|
| 1. | White marks on
darkly pigmented skin. | |
| 2. | White in white-
feathers of dark-
sized birds. | |
| 3. | Two colors in plumage
comb. | |
| 4. | Black back on black
bird. | |
| 5. | Japanese pattern with
spotted tail. | |
| 6. | Twisted wing in
Toucanidae. | |
| 7. | Middle toe of black
langshan feathered. | |
| 8. | Reddish bay eye in
bull terrier. | |
| 9. | Black leather on back
of common python. | |
| 10. | Eye absent in dark
corvidae. | |

Section III.

Based on the Production Judging Work as given at Michigan Agricultural College, Iowa State College, and Kansas State Agricultural College.

Examination will contain 10 questions from this section.

1. What significance do you attach to (a) June moult? (b) October moult?
2. What does a missing primary feather indicate?
3. Do primaries always moult singly?
4. Describe the wing of a steady layer when observed in October.
5. Has length of keel any importance in selecting a male?
6. Would rations have any effect on the amount of pigment present in July?
7. How many eggs should a hen lay to be profitably kept under farm conditions?
8. What is the condition of the abdomen when a hen is laying?
9. In what order does the yellow pigment disappear?
10. What do the following types of head indicate?
 - a. crow head
 - b. beefy head
 - c. refined head
 - d. overly refined head
11. Name the parts of the score card for judging for egg production and the percentage of each part.
12. Explain what is desired by good body type.
13. Describe the appearance of the parts of the head and adjuncts of a good producer.
14. List the points of good body conformation.
15. Explain what is meant by good handling qualities.
16. How does the appearance of the legs and toes look on a good producer?
17. What is meant by condition? Describe good condition.
18. Describe poor body type.
19. Describe the appearance of the parts of the head and adjuncts of a poor producer.

Section III

Based on the information regarding work as given to Michigan Agricultural College, Iowa State College, and Kansas State Agricultural College.

Examination will contain 10 questions from this section.

1. What significance do you attach to (a) June moult? (b) October moult?
2. What does a missing primary feather indicate?
3. Do primaries always moult singly?
4. Describe the wing of a steady layer when observed in October.
5. Has length of keel any importance in selecting a male?
6. Would nations have any effect on the amount of pigment present in July?
7. How many eggs should a hen lay to be profitably kept under farm conditions?
8. What is the condition of the abdomen when a hen is laying?
9. In what order does the yellow pigment disappear?
10. What do the following types of head indicate?
 - a. crow head
 - b. beefy head
 - c. refined head
 - d. overly refined head
11. Name the parts of the score card for judging for egg production and the percentage of each part.
12. Explain what is desired by good body type.
13. Describe the appearance of the parts of the head and adjuncts of a good producer.
14. List the points of good body conformation.
15. Explain what is meant by good handling qualities.
16. How does the appearance of the legs and feet look on a good producer?
17. What is meant by condition? Describe good condition.
18. Describe poor body type.
19. Describe the appearance of the parts of the head and adjuncts of a poor producer.

20. List the points of poor body conformation.
21. Explain what is meant by poor handling qualities.
22. How does the appearance of the legs and toes look on a poor producer?
23. Describe poor condition.
24. Describe the characteristics of a laying hen.
25. Describe the characteristics of a hen not laying.
26. What is meant by rate or intensity of production?
27. What is meant by persistence of production?
28. Describe the characteristics of the high rate hen.
29. Describe the characteristics of the low rate hen.
30. In what order does the yellow pigment return to the body after cessation of laying?

20. After the points of poor body conformation.
21. Explain what is meant by poor handling qualities.
22. How does the appearance of the legs and feet look on a poor prospect?
23. Describe poor conformation.
24. Describe the characteristics of a laying hen.
25. Describe the characteristics of a hen not laying.
26. What is meant by rate or intensity of production?
27. What is meant by persistence of production?
28. Describe the characteristics of the high rate hen.
29. Describe the characteristics of the low rate hen.
30. In what order does the yellow pigment return to the body after cessation of laying?
31. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
32. In what order does the yellow pigment disappear?
33. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
34. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
35. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
36. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
37. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
38. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
39. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
40. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
41. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
42. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
43. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
44. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
45. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
46. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
47. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
48. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
49. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
50. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
51. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
52. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
53. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
54. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
55. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
56. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
57. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
58. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
59. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
60. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
61. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
62. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
63. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
64. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
65. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
66. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
67. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
68. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
69. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
70. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
71. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
72. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
73. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
74. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
75. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
76. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
77. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
78. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
79. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
80. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
81. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
82. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
83. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
84. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
85. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
86. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
87. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
88. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
89. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
90. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
91. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
92. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
93. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
94. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
95. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
96. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
97. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
98. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
99. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?
100. What is the condition of the system when a hen is laying?

Answers to Section I.

1. A. "Class" indicates in most cases the origin of the various breeds, viz, American, Asiatic, Mediterranean, English, Polish, Hamburgs, French, Continental, etc.
B. "Breed" Fowls having the same characteristics of shape, growth, and temperament.
C. "Variety" is indicated by the combs or color markings of the specimen viz, 'Brown' Leghorn, 'Barred' Plymouth Rocks, 'Dark' Brahma, etc.
2. By the Scale of Points is meant the value placed by the American Poultry Association on the various sections of domestic fowl. In judging by either the Score Card or Comparison system the judge must use the Scale of Points to arrive at a correct decision.
3. Parti-colored fowls have two or more colors. A solid-colored fowl is of one color only.
4. Shape, because shape makes the breed and also because in most instances more emphasis is placed on shape than color in the Scale of Points.
5. All specimens -- in order to disqualify if necessary.
6. If a specimen is generally lacking in breed characteristics it is considered as not being pure bred.
7. Two points per pound in all varieties except Bantams, Anconas, Leghorn females, Polish, Hamburgs, Games, Orientals, Frizzles. A two point cut for weight disqualifies a Leghorn female. Disqualifying weights for chicks and poults do not apply until December 1st. of each year. 3 points cut for turkeys, ducks and geese.
8. All varieties of Bantams, Call and East India ducks.
9. If using the score card in judging a show all specimens having weight clauses must be weighed. Also under the comparison system in case of doubt as to which specimen is nearest standard weight or if a specimen appears so light in weight as to be disqualified.
10. Barred Plymouth Rocks, Dominiques, Silver and Golden Campines.
11. Neck, wings, back, tail and breast.
12. The cockerel because he is nearest Standard weight.
13. Light Brahma cock, first; Buff Orpington Cockerel, second; Rhode Island Red hen, fourth; Barred Rock pullet, fourth.
14. The one receiving the smallest total number of cuts for shape would win.

Answers to Section I.

1. "Ginger" indicates in most cases the origin of the various breeds, viz. American, Asiatic, Mediterranean, English, Polish, Hamburg, French, Continental, etc.
2. "Pied" fowls having the same characteristics of shape, growth, and temperament.
3. "Variety" is indicated by the comb or color markings of the specimen viz. 'Krause', 'Laguna', 'Barn', 'Plymouth Rock', 'Dark', 'Brahma', etc.
4. By the Scale of Points is meant the value placed by the American Poultry Association on the various sections of domestic fowl. In judging by either the score card or comparison system the judge must use the Scale of Points to arrive at a correct decision.
5. Parti-colored fowls have two or more colors. A solid-colored fowl is of one color only.
6. Shape, because shape makes the breed and also because in most instances more emphasis is placed on shape than color in the Scale of Points.
7. All specimens -- in order to disqualify it is necessary. If a specimen is generally lacking in breed characteristics it is considered as not being pure bred.
8. Two points per pound in all varieties except Bantams, Anconas, Laghans females, Polish, Hamburg, Game, Oriental, Frisles. A two point cut for weight disqualifies a Laghorn female. Disqualifying weights for chicks and poults do not apply until December 1st of each year. 3 points cut for turkeys, ducks and geese.
9. All varieties of Bantams, Goli and East India ducks.
10. If using the score card in judging a show all specimens having weight classes must be weighed. Also under the comparison system in case of doubt as to which specimen is nearest standard weight or if a specimen appears so light in weight as to be disqualified.
11. Banded Plymouth Rocks, Dominiques, Silver and Golden Campines.
12. Neck, wings, back, tail and breast.
13. The cockerel because he is nearest standard weight.
14. Light Brahma cock, first; Buff Orington Cockerel, second; Rhode Island Red hen, fourth; Banded Rock pullet, fourth.
15. The one receiving the smallest total number of cuts for shape would win.

15. "Mealiness" applied to Buff or Red ground color stippled with a lighter color. "Mossiness" irregular dark penciling in feathers that destroys a desirable contrast of color.
16. All breeds in American, Asiatic, Mediterranean, English, French, Continental, Games, and Game Bantams, Orientals, all breeds of Ducks except Runners and Crested White, all Geese have the same Scale of Points in their respective classes.
17. In Rose Comb Rhode Island Reds the spike should droop slightly, but not conform too closely to shape of head. In Wyandottes the entire comb should conform to the skull shape.
18. Buckeyes have pea-combs.
19. Black Wyandottes, Yellow shanks and feet; Black Javas under part of toes and bottom of feet; Jersey Black Giants, yellow under part of feet; Black Cochins, yellow shanks and feet; Single Comb Black Leghorns, yellow shanks and feet; Black Japanese Bantams, shanks and toes.
20. A specimen on which "scaly-leg" had destroyed the natural color would be disqualified.
21. Golden and Silver Sebright Bantam males should be "hen-feathered."
22. Bearded Golden, Bearded Silver, Bearded White and Buff Laced Polish; Mottled Houdans, White Hudans, Crevecoeurs.
23. A Rhode Island Red cock weighing 6 lbs. would be disqualified. A Buff Orpington cockerel weighing 8 lbs. would be cut one point after December 1st. of each year. A White Leghorn pullet weighing 2 1/2 lbs. after December 1st would be disqualified. A Dark Cornish cock weighing 9 3/4 lbs. would be cut one-half point.
24. Leghorn hen 4 lbs. Ancona hen 4 1/2 lbs.
25. Barred, White, Buff, Silver Penciled, Partridge, Columbian and Blue Plymouth Rocks; Silver Laced, Golden Laced, White, Buff, Black, Partridge, Silver Penciled, and Columbian Wyandottes; Black and Mottled Javas; Dominiques; Rose Comb Rhode Island Whites; Buckeyes; Chanticleer, Jersey Black Giant, Single and Rose Comb Rhode Island Reds.
26. Silver Laced Wyandotte males have white centered feathers laced with black. The breast of the Silver Penciled Plymouth Rock male is lustrous black.
27. Black Minorcas, legs and toes black or dark slate; Black Leghorns, legs and toes yellow; Black Wyandottes shanks and toes yellow; Anconas, shanks and toes yellow or yellow mottled with black.
28. Rocks: Cocks 9 1/2 lbs; Cockerels 8 lbs; hen 7 1/2 lbs; pullet 6 lbs.
29. Wyandottes: Cocks 8 1/2 lbs; Cockerels 7 1/2 lbs; hen 6 1/2 lbs; pullet 5 1/2 lb

15. "Nocturnal" applied to all or had ground color stippled with a lighter color. "Nocturnal" irregular dark penciling in feathers that denotes a definite contrast of color.
16. All breeds in American, Asiatic, Mediterranean, English, French, Continental, Japan, and some Russian, Oriental, all breeds of known except Japanese and English white, all breeds have the same scale of points in their respective classes.
17. In some cases Rhode Island the white should drop slightly, but not enough to cause a change of shape. In Wyandotte the entire comb should conform to the shell shape.
18. Japanese have two combs.
19. Black Wyandotte, Yellow Shanks and feet; Black Java, white feet of toes and bottom of feet; Jersey Black Orpington, yellow under feet of feet; Cuckoo, yellow under feet and feet; Rhode Island White Leghorns, yellow shanks and feet; Black Japanese Bantams, white and feet.
20. A specimen on which "sally-leg" had destroyed the natural color would be disqualified.
21. Golden and silver Nightingale Bantam males should be "sally-legged".
22. Banded Golden, Banded Silver, Banded White and Banded Laced Polish; Mottled Hamburg, White Hamburg, Orpington.
23. A Rhode Island Red cock weighing 6 lbs. would be disqualified. A Buff Orpington cock weighing 8 lbs. would be out on point after November 1st of each year. A White Leghorn male weighing 2 1/2 lbs. after November 1st would be disqualified. A Dark Cornish cock weighing 2 1/2 lbs. would be out on one-half point.
24. Leghorn hen 4 lbs. Ancon hen 4 1/2 lbs.
25. Banded White, Buff, Silver Penciled, Partridge, Columbian and Blue Plymouth Rocks; Silver Laced, Golden Laced, White, Buff, Black, Partridge, Silver Penciled, and Columbian Wyandottes; Black and Mottled Jersey; Landlarks; Newcomb Rhode Island White; Japanese; Orpingtons; Jersey Black Giant, single and Newcomb Rhode Island Red.
26. Silver Laced Wyandotte males have white penciled feathers laced with black. The crest of the Silver Penciled Plymouth Rock male is cinnamon black.
27. Black Minorcas, legs and feet black or dark blue; Black Leghorns, legs and feet yellow; Black Wyandotte shanks and feet yellow; Anconas, shanks and feet yellow or yellow mottled with black.
28. Rocks: Cocks 9 lbs; Cockerels 8 lbs; hen 7 1/2 lbs; pullet 6 lbs.
29. Wyandottes: Cocks 8 1/2 lbs; Cockerels 7 1/2 lbs; hen 6 1/2 lbs; pullet 5 1/2 lbs.

30. Orpingtons: Cocks 10 lbs; Cockerels $8\frac{1}{2}$ lbs; Hen 8 lbs; Pullet 7 lbs.
31. Leghorns: Cocks $5\frac{1}{2}$ lbs; Cockerels $4\frac{1}{2}$ lbs; Hen 4 lbs; Pullet $3\frac{1}{2}$ lbs.
32. R.I.Reds: Cocks $8\frac{1}{2}$ lbs; Cockerels $7\frac{1}{2}$ lbs; Hen $6\frac{1}{2}$ lbs; Pullet $5\frac{1}{2}$ lbs.
33. Minorcas:
S.C.Black and Buff: Cocks 9 lbs; Cockerels $7\frac{1}{2}$ lbs; Hen $7\frac{1}{2}$ lbs,
pullet $6\frac{1}{2}$ lbs.
S.C.White: R.C.Black and R.C.White: Cock 8 lbs; Cockerels $6\frac{1}{2}$ lbs,
Hen $6\frac{1}{2}$ lbs; pullet $5\frac{1}{2}$ lbs.
34. Brahma: Cocks 12 lbs; Cockerels 10 lbs; Hen $9\frac{1}{2}$ lbs; Pullet 8 lbs.
35. None.
36. Single, Rose, Pea and Cushion.
37. Three kinds of combs: Single, Rose and Pea.
38. Lack of vigor, dirty plumage, scaly leg, and body parasites.
39. The one receiving the smallest total number of shape cuts would win.
40. The one weighing seven pounds because he is nearest standard weight.
41. One-fourth point on fronts, bows and bar, one-half point on primaries and one point on secondaries.
42. One-fourth points. Rhode Island Red males cut one and one-half points. Leghorn males cut two and one-half points.
43. Barred Plymouth Rocks have a single comb; regular barring; and the Plymouth Rock shape. Dominiques have a rose comb; irregular barring and the Dominique shape.
44. The medium shade of orange color having a rich, golden cast is preferred. See definition of "Buff" in Standard of Perfection.
45. Pepperling is a sprinkling of gray or black; mealiness is the term applied to all other sprinklings of other colors where the sprinkling is lighter than the ground color.
46. Pepperling might be found in all white, red, and buff varieties or any other variety carrying white or buff colored areas.
47. Yes. Malays, Orientals, Games, and Game Bantams have a Scale of Points that include stern.
48. Games and Game Bantams and Malays.
49. Yes. Polish, Hamburgs, Games, Sumatras, Miscellaneous.
50. Caruncles are small fleshy protuberances as on head of turkey or Muscovy duck.
51. Yes. Games, Game Bantams and Malays.

52. On the grounds of improper weighing, mistaken disqualifications, or in case of apparent dishonesty, ignorance or carelessness on the part of the judge.

53. Mediterranean Class:

<u>Breeds</u>	<u>Varieties</u>
Leghorns.....	(Single-Comb Dark Brown Single-Comb Light Brown Rose-Comb Brown Single-Comb White Rose-Comb White Single-Comb Buff Single-Comb Black Single-Comb Silver
Minorcas.....	(Single-Comb Black Rose-Comb Black Single-Comb White Rose-Comb White Single-Comb Buff
Spanish.....	White-Faced Black
Blue Andalusians.....	
Anconas.....	(Single-Comb Rose-Comb

54. English Class:

<u>Breeds</u>	<u>Varieties</u>
Dorkings.....	(White Silver-Gray Colored
Redcaps.....	
Orpingtons.....	(Single-Comb Buff Single-Comb Black Single-Comb White Single-Comb Blue
Cornish.....	(Dark White White-Laced Red
Sussex.....	(Speckled Red

52. On the grounds of manager weighing, mistaken disqualifications, or in case of apparent dishonesty, ignorance or carelessness on the part of the judge.

53. Medal Presentation Class:

Varieties Exhibits

(Single-Camp Dark Brown)
(Single-Camp Light Brown)
(Rose-Camp Brown)
(Single-Camp White)
(Rose-Camp White)
(Single-Camp Buff)
(Single-Camp Black)
(Single-Camp Silver)

(Single-Camp Black)
(Rose-Camp Black)
(Single-Camp White)
(Rose-Camp White)
(Single-Camp Buff)

Spanish..... White-faced Black

Birds.....

(Single-Camp)
(Rose-Camp)

54. English Class:

Varieties Exhibits

(White)
(Silver-Gray)
(Colored)

(Single-Camp Buff)
(Single-Camp Black)
(Single-Camp White)
(Single-Camp Blue)

(Dark)
(White)
(White-faced Red)

(Spotted)
(Red)

Answers to Section III.

1. (a) Low yearly record. (b) High yearly record.
2. Rest period of seven to ten days.
3. No.
4. All primary feathers present.
5. Yes.
6. Yes.
7. Ten to twelve dozen.
8. Soft, pliable, deep.
9. Vent, eye ring, ear lobe, beak, shanks.
10. (a) Slow maturity - low vitality.
(b) Fat, poor producer.
(c) Good layer.
(d) Fair producer, but lacks vitality.

11. Body type (as seen in coop or on floor)
Head and adjuncts.
Body conformation (as determined by handling)
Handling quality
Legs and toes
Condition

25
15
30
10
5
15

100

12. Deep breast
Long level back
Deep abdomen
Straight underline
Broad body
Light feathering
Angular appearance.
13. Lean face
Large comb
Bright red color
Large oval eyes
Prominent eye
Medium well curved beak
Beak bleached out
Moderately broad and deep.
14. Long keel
Deep broad body
Large full abdomen.

Answers to Section III.

1. (a) low yearly record. (b) High yearly record.

2. Best period of seven to ten days.

3. No.

4. All primary feathers present.

5. Yes.

6. Yes.

7. Ten to twelve dozen.

8. Soft, pliable, coop.

9. Vent, eye ring, ear lobe, beak, shanks.

10. (a) slow maturity - low vitality.

(b) fat, poor producers.

(c) good layer.

(d) fair producers, but lacks vitality.

11. Body type (as seen in coop or on floor)

Head and adjustment.

Body conformation (as determined by handling)

Handling quality

Legs and feet

Condition

25
15
30
10
25
15

100

12. Deep breast

Long level back

Deep abdomen

Straight underline

Good body

Light feathering

Angular appearance

13. Lean face

Large comb

Bright red color

Large oval eyes

Prominent eye

Neckline well curved back

Beak pointed out

Moderately broad and deep.

14. Long neck

Deep broad body

Large full abdomen.

15. Loose, thin and mellow skin.
Pliable and soft abdomen
Thin, pliable, pelvic bones.
16. Bleached out shanks
Flat, pliable and smooth scaled legs
Short, blunt, smooth toe nails.
17. By condition is meant the ability to both withstand and produce the high egg production sought for in domestic fowls. This is shown by:
 Old rough feathers
 Fast late moulting
 Good health, vigor and vitality.
18. Short back
 High shoulders
 Shallow breast
 Shallow abdomen
 Tapering underline
 Narrow body
 Loose feathered
 Round in appearance.
19. Short and too deep
 Too long and shallow
 Puffy or coarse face
 Small comb
 Pale or purplish comb
 Small round eye
 Sunken eye
 Long sharp beak
 Beak yellow.
20. Short keel
 Shallow narrow body
 Small abdomen
 Short, narrow, tapering back
21. Light, thick, coarse skin
 Light and hard abdomen
 Thick, stiff pelvic bones.
22. Yellow shanks
 Round, rough legs
 Long, pointed toe nails.
23. New, smooth plumage
 Slow, early moulting
 Poor health, vigor and vitality.
24. Vent is large, dilated, oblong and moist
 Pubic bones are flexible and wide apart
 Comb is large, red, full and glossy
 Wattles and lobes are prominent, soft and smooth.

15. Loose, thin and mellow skin.
Flexible and soft abdomen.
Thin, pliable, pelvic bones.
16. Blended out shape.
Virt, pliable and smooth scaled legs.
Short, blunt, smooth toe nails.
17. By condition is meant the ability to both withstand and produce the high egg production sought for in domestic fowls. This is shown by:
Old tough feathers
Late late moult
Good health, vigor and vitality.
18. Short back.
High shoulders.
Shallow breast.
Shallow abdomen.
Tapering underline.
Narrow body.
Loose feathered.
Round in appearance.
19. Short and too deep.
Too long and shallow.
Belly or coarse legs.
Small comb.
Pale or purplish comb.
Small round eye.
Sunken eye.
Long sharp beak.
Beak yellow.
20. Short keel.
Shallow narrow body.
Small abdomen.
Short, narrow, tapering back.
21. Light, thick, coarse skin.
Light and hard abdomen.
Thick, stiff pelvic bones.
22. Yellow shape.
Round, rough legs.
Long, pointed toe nails.
23. New, smooth plumage.
Slow, early moult.
Poor health, vigor and vitality.
24. Vent is large, dilated, oblong and moist.
Pubic bones are flexible and wide apart.
Comb is large, red, full and glossy.
Wattles and lobes are prominent, soft and smooth.

25. Vent is small, contracted, round and dry
Pubic bones are rigid and close together
Comb is small, pale, scaly
Wattles and lobes are inconspicuous, rough and dry.
26. The rate or intensity of production is the frequency of eggs during the laying period. It is usually determined by the average number of eggs laid per month.
27. Persistence of production is the length of time of the laying period. It is usually determined by the number of months a hen is in production.
28. Keel slopes downward
Pubic bones point straight out and have thin tips
Abdominal capacity of four to five fingers
Abdomen soft, pliable, dilated
Rump broad, with width carried back
Lateral processes prominent and pointing outward
Skin soft, loose, silky.
29. Keel slopes upward
Pubic bones curve in and tips are thick
Abdominal capacity of two fingers or less
Abdomen fatty, hard, contracted
Rump narrow and cramped.
Lateral processes are hard to find and pointed inward
Skin thick, dry, underlaid with fat.
30. It reappears in the sections in the same order in which it disappears, returning however much faster than it disappears.

25. Vent is small, contracted, round and dry. Pubic bones are rigid and close together. Girth is small, pale, easily. Hottles and lobes are inconspicuous, rough and dry.
26. The rate or intensity of production is the frequency of eggs during the laying period. It is usually determined by the average number of eggs laid per month.
27. Periodicness of production is the length of time of the laying period. It is usually determined by the number of months a hen is in production.
28. Keel slopes downward. Pubic bones point straight out and have thin tips. Abdominal capacity of four to five fingers. Abdomen soft, pliable, dilated. Rump broad, with width curved back. Lateral processes prominent and pointing outward. Skin soft, loose, silky.
29. Keel slopes upward. Pubic bones curve in and tips are thick. Abdominal capacity of two fingers or less. Abdomen fatty, hard, contracted. Rump narrow and cramped. Lateral processes are hard to find and pointed inward. Skin thick, dry, mottled with fat.
30. It responds in the sections in the same order in which it disappears, returning however much faster than it disappears.
31. Vent is large, dilated, shiny and moist. Pubic bones are flexible and wide apart. Girth is large, red, full and glossy. Hottles and lobes are prominent, thin and smooth.
32. Keel slopes upward. Pubic bones curve in and tips are thick. Abdominal capacity of two fingers or less. Abdomen fatty, hard, contracted. Rump narrow and cramped. Lateral processes are hard to find and pointed inward. Skin thick, dry, mottled with fat.
33. Vent is large, dilated, shiny and moist. Pubic bones are flexible and wide apart. Girth is large, red, full and glossy. Hottles and lobes are prominent, thin and smooth.
34. Keel slopes upward. Pubic bones curve in and tips are thick. Abdominal capacity of two fingers or less. Abdomen fatty, hard, contracted. Rump narrow and cramped. Lateral processes are hard to find and pointed inward. Skin thick, dry, mottled with fat.
35. Vent is large, dilated, shiny and moist. Pubic bones are flexible and wide apart. Girth is large, red, full and glossy. Hottles and lobes are prominent, thin and smooth.
36. Keel slopes upward. Pubic bones curve in and tips are thick. Abdominal capacity of two fingers or less. Abdomen fatty, hard, contracted. Rump narrow and cramped. Lateral processes are hard to find and pointed inward. Skin thick, dry, mottled with fat.
37. Vent is large, dilated, shiny and moist. Pubic bones are flexible and wide apart. Girth is large, red, full and glossy. Hottles and lobes are prominent, thin and smooth.
38. Keel slopes upward. Pubic bones curve in and tips are thick. Abdominal capacity of two fingers or less. Abdomen fatty, hard, contracted. Rump narrow and cramped. Lateral processes are hard to find and pointed inward. Skin thick, dry, mottled with fat.
39. Vent is large, dilated, shiny and moist. Pubic bones are flexible and wide apart. Girth is large, red, full and glossy. Hottles and lobes are prominent, thin and smooth.
40. Keel slopes upward. Pubic bones curve in and tips are thick. Abdominal capacity of two fingers or less. Abdomen fatty, hard, contracted. Rump narrow and cramped. Lateral processes are hard to find and pointed inward. Skin thick, dry, mottled with fat.


The Poultry Judging Team

PAUL A. FUNK '27

THE annual poultry judging contest is held at the time of the Midwest Poultry Show at the Coliseum, Chicago. This year the contest was held December 9 and 10, ten mid-west Universities being represented.

The Illinois team was coached by Mr. D. C. Henderson and was composed of the following: George A. Baker '26, Hubert J. Sloan '26 and Clyde L. Crawford '26. Though the team did not return with the lion's

It is well for any prospective member of the poultry team to begin laying plans now. Animal Husbandry 37 given next semester is a prerequisite to 38 from which the judging team is selected. The first course deals with the general practices that have been proven successful in poultry raising. It is a course of practical worth to the agricultural student and in addition prepares him to try out for the judging team.



THE POULTRY JUDGING TEAM

Left to right—Henderson (instructor), Sloan, Crawford, Baker.

share of the trophies, they report that all those concerned with the grading knew that the Illinois team was in there to the finish. In fact the team placed sixth and in elaboration of the above statement it is rumored that they were crowding the leaders until the last disastrous placing of one puzzling class of Leghorn cock-birds. As with all such contests, poultry, livestock, dairy-cattle, grain and what not, the measure of a team's success is not necessarily the medals they bring home but the experience and knowledge gained, the acquaintances formed that serve as rewards for years.

The Inspection Trip

Thursday night after the contest the prizes were announced to the winners at a banquet held at the Auditorium Hotel. Everyone present declared the banquet the best ever in food, prevailing congeniality and the suspense preceding the awarding of the numerous prizes. The next day, Friday, all the teams were guests of the Chamber of Commerce, Chicago. A fleet of taxis had been ordered to carry the visiting poultry-men to all the central poultry marketing establishments on the west side. They also visited the famous South Water street market

and were guided through the Central Cold Storage Plant one of the largest in the world in that line of business. They were then taken to the Sherman Hotel where President Coolidge was entertained while on his recent short visit to Chicago. The visitors were served a luncheon there that was treated with all due respect after such a strenuous morning. At the close of the meal Mr. Friebe who acted as host complimented the men for their interest in that great industry, poultry, and stressed the importance of a great central market, Chicago, to the poultry industry. Prof. G. A. Phillips, Purdue, acted as spokesman for the group in appreciation of the entertainment given to them as guests of the Chamber of Commerce.

Who will be the lucky ones next year? Start Planning NOW!

—A—

HOW THIRSTY IS A TREE?

The inventor of galvanized iron ash cans probably never would have thought to offer his product to the United States Department of Agriculture as equipment for a forest laboratory. Yet at the field station on Mount Manitou, operated by the Rocky Mountain Forest Experiment Station, a battery of some 40 or 50 of these cans has been installed this year.

The cans are the principal equipment in an important transpiration test, or, in other words, a study of the relative thirstiness of different tree species in various soils. Four soils are used, in which are planted, 10 or 12 to a can, the greater part of 700 one-year-old seedlings. The size of the test made ash cans the most economical sort of flower pot to use.

To measure the amount of moisture the little trees require, the cans are sealed in around the seedlings, leaving only a small covered opening where water in measured quantities can be poured in. The dampness or dryness of the soil in the cans may be estimated at any time by weight. No water can escape except by transpiration through the leaves. Seedlings will be pulled up, weighed, and photographed, from time to time during the next four years. About 40 plants of each species are expected to be "in at the finish" in 1929.

—A—

An acre of sweet clover ordinarily will support 20 to 30 shotes.

—A—

The key to successful agriculture has always been its flocks and herds. —Calvin Coolidge.

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION

Some Practical Accomplishments in Vocational Agriculture

ARTHUR R. SMITH EX-23

NOW that the last ton litter in the Illinois State Ton Litter contest has been weighed, it is found that the litter of 16 Purebred Duroc Jersey pigs raised in the Special club of Oakwood Township High School at Muncie, Illinois which was supervised by the instructor of vocational agriculture, was the champion Duroc-Jersey ton litter in the state.

This litter was not only first out of the 63 Duroc-Jersey ton litters but was third in the state out of all the ton litters weighed in. This litter made a total of 3715 pounds in the 180 days feeding period, which averaged 232.2 pounds per head. This record does not come up to the present state and world's record but it does exceed last year's state record by about 400 pounds.

These 16 pigs were farrowed in March by one of the 105 sows which were farmed out in our special Duroc-Jersey club by a prominent breeder of Danville, Illinois, and was given the same supervision as were all the rest of the 105 litters.

This large club along with the rest of the projects made up the greater part of the live stock exhibits at the annual fall festival, so it would be well to explain how the fall festival was started and is being conducted.

The custom of having an annual gathering of the patrons of Oakwood Township High School at Muncie, Illinois, was started several years ago, and was called "The Fall Festival." This fall festival then included an evening program, sponsored by the grade schools of the township, some exhibits of grade school work, exhibits of cooking and sewing brought in by the women, and corn and vegetables exhibited by the farmers.

Since the first fall festival, interest in this event has grown to such an extent that it has been necessary to add more classes to the list of entries and to increase the prize money year by

The problem of getting Smith-Hughes boys to take an active part in community work and projects is one which often confronts the Agricultural teacher. This article tells of one method of getting results through the Annual Fall Festival. It may prove helpful as a suggestion to men who are interested in this field of work.

year until this year they had a "Fall Festival" that was probably the largest of its kind ever held at any high school.

The event was held this year on October 16 and 17, on the high school grounds with the idea of making it not only an annual get-together for the patrons of the township, but also a homecoming time for the old graduates of the high school.

It has been the custom, for the last three years for the instructor of vocational agriculture to act as secretary and to make most of the plans. The writer having had two years experience in managing this fall festival had learned that the time to start the plans for the 1925 show was soon after the fall festival in 1924. He, therefore, acted accordingly with the hope of making this show excel all others.

The first thing that was done was to have a grade school teachers' committee meeting and adopt the entry list to be used for the year so that the grade school teachers would have a year in which to have their pupils prepare their exhibits of drawing, writing, etc. After that, a committee meeting was called to revise and adopt the list of entries of the sewing, cooking, grain and vegetable exhibits. This being done, and several copies of each sent out, the big task that re-

mained was to get more boys and girls started on their club projects so that we could increase our live stock exhibits, a feature added to the fall festival in 1924. At the 1924 show we had only a few pigs and sheep shown. The most of the pigs were purebred Duroc-Jerseys from six sows that were farmed out on the shares to boys in the animal husbandry class, by a prominent man of Danville, Illinois, who is one of the largest purebred Duroc-Jersey breeders in the United States. He also gave us \$100 prize money in addition to a sum given by the school board to help put the idea across of showing livestock at our fall festival.

Soon after the fall festival of 1924, we began to get so many requests from farmers and boys in and around our high school, for these good Duroc-Jersey sows and gilts, that we decided to put out a club of 100 head if we could get them on the same plan. Due to the generosity of this same breeder, we were able not only to get as many sows and gilts as we wanted but also an increase to \$500 prize money for the pigs raised in this Special Duroc-Jersey club. During November, December and January, we spent our spare time doing some extension work in addition to our regular project and classroom work and succeeded in farming out 105 sows and gilts for our club, in and close to Oakwood township.

We started our supervision of these sows and gilts when they were delivered to the farmers and boys in January. Then we made as many visits during the spring and summer as was possible without neglecting the other projects of the agriculture classes.

Each litter was given as good care as was possible from the standpoint of feed, care and sanitation and every litter was vaccinated for cholera. By the time of the Illinois and Indiana

Sixth Midwest Intercollegiate Poultry Judging Contest
Chicago - December 10, 1925

(Teams in order of final placing)

7
17 copies
triple

- 1) Purdue ^{Univ.} - F. E. Christen, J. S. Huang, J. S. Walters
Coach - R. H. Schwartz
- 2) Iowa State ^{College} - R. K. Porter, W. E. Schultz, H. ^{Wilcke} ~~Wilcke~~
Coach - H. A. Bittenbender
- 3) Oklahoma ^{A. & M.} - J. D. Grant, J. Hollar, C. Wick
Coach - R. B. Thompson
- 4) Ohio State ^{Univ.} - Miss Norma Frank, R. Pretz, P. Zumbro
Coach - E. L. Baken
- 5) Michigan State College - R. Hornwood, H. T. Hunter, D. E. Spotts
Coach - C. G. Card
- 6) ^{Univ. of} Illinois - G. A. Baker, C. L. Crawford, H. J. Sloan
Coach - D. C. Henderson
- 7) Univ. of Missouri - G. E. Armin, H. E. Files, R. H. Knorr
Coach - E. W. Henderson
- 8) Kansas State Agr. College - S. M. Raleigh, A. M. Watson, W. Wisnicky
Coach - H. H. Steup
- 9) Univ. of Wisconsin - C. M. Rice, R. M. Klevay, C. W. Wigglesworth
Coach - C. E. Raufman
- 10) Univ. of Nebraska - J. W. Taylor, Geo. West, W. Woodward
Coach - S. J. Marsden

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

1925 poultry Judging Contest

Receipts

Zenoleum Products Co.	\$100.00 ✓
Buckeye Incubator Co.	50.00 ✓
Queen Incubator Co.	50.00 ✓
Coliseum Show Management	25.00 ✓
Collis Products Co.	50.00 ✓
G. E. Conkey Co.	35.00 ✓
Albert Dickinson Co.	35.00 ✓
Keyes-Davis Co.	35.00 ✓
Newtown Incubator Co. (Silver Cup furnished)	-----
A.P.A. - 6 medals furnished	\$380.00

Expenses

Gold for cash prizes	\$200.00
5 gold medals	78.75
2 silver medals	9.50
2 bronze medals	6.00
Engraving 9 medals (@ 42¢ a letter)	25.92
1 silver loving cup - exhibition	21.30
	<u>\$341.47</u>
Credit Balance	\$38.53
Deficit - 1924	25.50
Net Credit Balance - 12/19/25	<u>\$13.03</u>

Expenses on Kentucky Production Bids
Balance

2.64
* 10.39

OFFICIAL SCORES AND PLACINGS
6th Intercollegiate Poultry Judging Contest

1925 - Judging Contest

		EXHIBITION						PRODUCTION												
Correct Placing		5 10 3-4-2-1	5 5 1-3-4-2	5 10 1-4-2-3	5 10 10 3-1-4-2-2-1-4-3	10 10 2-1-4-3			10 4-3-2-1	4-1-2-3	3-4-1-2	10 4-1-2-3	10 1-4-2-3							
Team	No.	Name of Indiv.	Leghorn Cocks	Red Pullets	Red Cocks	B.P. Rock Pullets	Wyand. Pullets	Total Score	Placing	Reds	Leghorn	W. P. Rocks	Wyandottes	B. P. Rocks	Total Score	Placing	Writ. Exam.	Placing	Indv. Grand Total	Final Place.
MICHIGAN	1	Spotts, D.E.	3-1-4-2-3 70	1-2-4-3 80	1-2-4-3 90	3-4-2-1 70	1-2-4-3 90	400	3	4-3-2-1 100	1-4-2-3 85	4-3-1-2 85	4-3-1-2 70	4-2-1-3 70	410	6	311.5	6	1121.5	8
	2	Hunter, H.T.	3-2-1-4-4 70	4-1-3-2 70	4-1-2-3 95	3-1-2-4 90	1-3-2-4 55	380		2-3-4-1 60	1-4-2-3 85	4-3-1-2 85	4-3-2-1 60	4-1-2-3 90	380		299.7		1059.7	
	3	Horwood, R.	3-2-1-4-1 70	1-3-4-2 100	1-4-2-3 100	1-2-4-3 45	1-2-4-3 90	405	9	2-3-4-1 60	4-1-2-3 100	4-3-1-2 85	4-3-1-2 70	2-1-4-3 70	385		304.7		1094.7	
	Team		210	250	285	205	235	1185		220	270	255	200	230	1175		915.9		3275.9	
WISCONSIN	4	C. W. Wigglesworth.	3-2-4-1-4 90	4-1-3-2 70	1-2-4-3 90	2-1-4-3 25	1-2-3-4 75	350		3-4-2-1 90	1-4-2-3 85	3-1-4-2 85	4-3-1-2 70	4-2-1-3 70	400	2	287.5	10	1037.5	9
	5	Bice, C. M.	2-3-1-4-1 55	1-3-4-2 100	1-4-2-3 100	1-3-2-4 85	3-4-1-2 10	350		4-3-2-1 100	4-1-2-3 100	4-3-1-2 85	4-3-1-2 70	4-1-2-3 90	445	3	265.0		1060.0	
	6	Kleray, L.M.	1-4-3-2-4 50	1-3-2-4 70	1-4-2-3 100	1-4-2-3 55	1-3-4-2 40	315	10	4-3-2-1 100	4-1-2-3 100	3-4-1-2 100	4-3-1-2 70	2-4-1-3 60	430	6	277.2		1022.2	
	Team		195	240	290	165	125	1015		290	285	270	210	220	1275		829.7		3119.7	
OHIO	7	A Frank, Norma	4-3-2-1-1 95	1-3-4-2 100	1-4-2-3 100	1-2-4-3 45	1-2-3-4 75	415	7	3-2-4-1 70	1-4-2-3 85	4-3-2-1 70	4-3-2-1 60	4-1-2-3 90	375		313.0		1103.0	
	8	Zumbro, P.	3-4-2-1-3 100	1-1-4-2 95	1-4-2-3 100	3-1-2-4 90	1-3-4-2 40	425	5	4-3-2-1 100	1-4-2-3 85	4-3-1-2 85	4-1-3-2 85	4-1-2-3 90	445	4	299.3		1169.3	4
	9	Pretz, L.	1-4-3-2-4 50	1-3-2-4 95	1-4-2-3 100	1-4-2-3 45	1-3-4-2 45	335		4-3-2-1 100	1-4-2-3 85	3-4-1-2 100	4-3-2-1 60	2-4-1-3 60	405		278.8		1018.8	
	Team		245	290	300	180	160	1175		270	255	255	205	240	1225		891.1		3291.1	
FURDUE	10	Huang, I. S.	4-3-2-1-1 95	1-3-4-2 100	1-4-2-3 100	3-1-4-2 100	2-1-4-3 100	495	1	4-3-2-1 100	1-4-2-3 85	4-3-1-2 85	4-3-1-2 70	4-1-2-3 90	430	7	314.1		1239.1	1
	11	Walters, J.S.	4-3-2-1-4 95	1-1-3-2 70	1-4-2-3 100	3-1-2-4 90	1-2-3-4 75	430	4	3-4-2-1 90	1-2-4-3 70	3-4-1-2 100	4-3-2-1 60	4-1-2-3 90	410	1	300.3	5	1140.3	7
	12	Christen, F.E.	1-3-2-4-1 45	1-4-3-2 95	1-4-2-3 100	2-1-4-3 25	1-2-3-4 75	340		4-3-2-1 100	1-4-2-3 85	3-4-1-2 100	4-3-1-2 70	4-1-2-3 90	445	2	312.7		1097.7	
	Team		235	265	300	215	250	1265		290	240	285	200	270	1285		927.1		3477.1	
ILLINOIS	13	Sloan, E.J.	3-1-2-4-3 60	1-1-4-2 95	4-1-2-3 95	3-1-2-4 90	1-4-3-2 55	395		4-3-2-1 100	1-4-2-3 85	4-3-1-2 85	4-3-1-2 70	4-1-2-3 90	430	7	316.4	10	1141.4	6
	14	Crawford, C.L.	2-3-1-4-1 55	1-3-4-2 100	1-4-2-3 100	1-3-2-4 70	3-1-2-4 45	370	9	3-4-2-1 90	1-4-2-3 100	4-3-2-1 70	4-3-1-2 70	4-1-2-3 90	420	10	295.4	4	1085.4	6
	15	Baker, G.A.	1-2-4-3-3 15	1-1-2-4 80	1-4-2-3 100	1-4-2-3 55	1-3-4-2 40	290		3-4-2-1 90	1-4-2-3 85	4-3-2-1 70	4-3-1-2 70	4-1-2-3 90	405		326.0	4	1021.0	
	Team		130	275	295	215	140	1055		280	270	225	210	270	1255		937.8		3247.8	
AMES	16	Schultz, W.E.	3-4-2-1-1 100	1-3-2-4 85	1-4-2-3 100	4-1-2-3 45	1-2-3-4 75	405	10	4-3-2-1 100	1-4-2-3 85	3-4-1-2 100	4-3-2-1 60	4-1-2-3 90	435	5	327.5	2	1167.5	5
	17	Porter, R.K.	3-4-1-2-1 85	1-4-3-2 95	1-4-2-3 100	3-4-2-1 55	1-3-2-4 55	390	6	4-3-2-1 100	1-4-2-3 85	3-4-2-1 85	4-3-1-2 70	4-2-1-3 70	410	3	315.5	1	1115.5	2
	18	Wilcke, H.	3-4-1-2-4 85	1-1-3-2 70	4-1-2-3 95	3-4-2-1 70	4-3-2-1 40	360		4-3-2-1 100	1-4-2-3 85	4-3-1-2 85	4-3-1-2 70	4-1-2-3 90	430	7	327.5	2	1117.5	10
	Team		270	250	295	170	170	1155		300	255	270	200	250	1275		970.5		3400.5	
MISSOURI	19	Knoop, R. H.	2-4-3-1-3 70	1-1-2-4 80	4-1-2-3 95	4-2-1-3 35	2-1-3-4 85	365		2-3-1-4 40	1-4-2-3 85	3-4-1-2 100	4-3-1-2 70	2-1-4-3 70	365		303.5		1033.5	
	20	Annin, G.E.	3-2-4-1-1 90	1-4-3-2 95	1-4-2-3 100	3-1-2-4 90	2-1-3-4 85	460	2	3-2-1-4 55	2-1-4-3 55	3-4-1-2 100	4-3-1-2 70	2-1-4-3 70	350	8	310.5	8	1120.5	7
	21	Files, H.E.	1-2-3-4-3 25	1-4-1-2 70	1-4-2-3 100	3-4-2-1 55	2-1-3-4 85	335		4-3-2-1 100	1-4-2-3 85	4-3-1-2 85	4-3-2-1 60	4-2-1-3 70	400		287.0		1022.0	
	Team		185	245	295	180	255	1160		195	225	285	200	210	1115		901.0		3176.0	
NEBRASKA	22	Woodward, W.	4-1-3-2-4 55	1-1-3-2 70	1-4-2-3 100	1-4-3-2 70	2-1-4-3 100	395		4-1-2-3 55	2-1-3-4 40	1-4-3-2 55	4-1-2-3 100	4-2-1-3 70	320		317.5	9	1032.5	
	23	Taylor, J.W.	1-4-3-2-1 50	1-4-3-2 95	1-2-4-3 90	3-2-1-4 70	4-2-3-1 55	360	7	3-1-4-2 55	1-4-2-3 85	4-3-1-2 85	4-1-3-2 85	4-1-2-3 90	400	10	325.5	5	1085.5	10
	24	West, Geo.	4-1-3-2-3 55	1-1-4-2 95	1-4-2-3 100	3-2-4-1 65	1-2-3-4 75	390		2-4-3-1 70	1-2-4-3 70	4-1-3-2 70	4-3-2-1 60	2-1-4-3 70	340		258.9		988.9	
	Team		160	260	290	205	230	1145		180	195	210	245	230	1060		901.9		3106.9	
KANSAS	25	Raleigh, S.M.	2-4-3-1-1 70	1-1-3-4 100	1-2-4-3 90	3-4-2-1 70	3-2-4-1 45	375		2-4-3-1 70	1-4-2-3 85	4-1-3-2 70	4-2-3-1 70	4-1-2-3 90	385		307.2		1067.2	
	26	Watson, A.M.	4-3-2-1-3 95	1-1-4-2 95	1-4-2-3 100	3-4-2-1 55	1-2-3-4 75	420	6	3-4-2-1 90	1-2-4-3 70	1-4-2-3 40	4-3-1-2 70	3-4-2-1 25	295	9	325.3	6	1040.3	8
	27	Wisnicky, W.	1-4-2-3-3 25	1-1-4-2 95	4-1-2-3 95	3-4-2-1 55	3-1-2-4 45	315		3-4-2-1 90	1-4-2-3 100	1-4-3-2 165	4-3-1-2 70	4-1-2-3 90	405		322.5	7	1042.5	
	Team		190	290	285	180	165	1110		250	255	165	210	205	1085		955.0		3150.0	
OKLAHOMA	28	Wick, C.	2-4-3-1-1 70	1-1-3-4 100	1-2-4-3 90	3-4-1-2 90	2-1-3-4 85	415	8	4-3-2-1 100	1-4-2-3 100	3-1-4-2 85	4-3-1-2 70	4-1-2-3 90	445	1	313.7		1173.7	2
	29	Grout, J.D.	3-2-4-1-3 90	1-1-4-2 95	1-4-2-3 100	3-4-2-1 55	1-3-2-4 55	395		2-1-4-3 40	1-2-4-3 70	1-4-3-2 55	4-3-2-1 60	2-1-4-3 70	295		333.3	1	1023.3	
	30	Hollar, I.	4-3-2-1-3 95	1-1-2-4 80	4-1-2-3 95	3-1-4-2 100	1-3-2-4 85	455	3	2-3-1-4 40	1-4-2-3 85	3-1-4-2 85	4-1-3-2 85	1-4-2-3 100	395	7	320.8	8	1170.8	3
	Team		255	275	265	245	225	1265		180	255	225	215	260	1135		967.8		3367.8	
Totals			2075	2640	2900	1960	1955	11530		2455	2505	2445	2095	2385	11885		9197.8		32612.8	

7th ANNUAL INTERCOLLEGIATE POULTRY JUDGING CONTEST

Chicago, Illinois - December 11, 1926

Institution

Iowa State College
University of Missouri
Kansas State Agr. College
Ohio State University
Oklahoma A & M College
Texas A & M College
Purdue University
University of Nebraska
Michigan State College
North Dakota Agricultural College

Coach

Professor H. A. Bittenbender
Professor E. W. Henderson
Professor H. H. Steup
Professor E. L. Dakan
Professor Robert Penquite
Professor D. F. Irving
Professor L. H. Schwartz
Professor S. J. Marsden
Professor C. G. Card
Professor O. A. Barton

Iowa State College Winning Team

Front row: C. L. Hall, M. J. Maxted, Wm. Kohlmeier

Back row: C. W. Knox, Dean J. Carter, George Jeck, Prof. H. A. Bittenbender



Seventh Midwest Intercollegiate

Poultry Judging Contest

1926

Packet contains:

1. Minutes of coaches meeting held December 11, 1926.
2. Financial Statement and list of donors of prizes and cash.

Make-up of Contest:

Exhibition Judging - Five four-bird rings

White Wyandotte Pullets
Barred Plymouth Rock Pullets
Rhode Island Red Cockerels
Rhode Island Red Pullets
White Leghorn Cockerels

Production Judging - Five four-bird rings

Rhode Island Red Yearling Hens
White Leghorn Yearling Hens
White Leghorn Yearling Hens
White Plymouth Rock Yearling Hens
Barred Plymouth Rock Yearling Hens

Written Examination -

Questions on the American Standard of Perfection

TEAM PLACINGS

Seventh Annual Judging Contest Chicago - December 11, 1926

1. Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa
(M. Maxted, G. L. Hall, D. J. Carter)
H. A. Bittenbender, Coach
2. University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri
(E. E. Schnetzler, D. M. Young, G. Bryan)
E. W. Henderson, Coach
3. Kansas State Agricultural College, Manhattan, Kansas
(W. M. Mann, L. E. Melia, V. M. Rucker)
H. H. Steup, Coach
4. Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
(H. W. Kennedy, S. Paisley, E. Moore)
E. L. Dakan, Coach
5. Oklahoma A. and M. College, Stillwater, Oklahoma
(L. Kilpatrick, A. Chase, W. Miller)
Robert Penquite, Coach
6. Texas A. and M. College, College Station, Texas
(S. I. Stratton, Jr., J. B. Kiber, O. J. Hanszen)
D. F. Irving, Coach
7. Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana
(G. Barge, M. Hart, J. Eastman)
L. H. Schwartz, Coach
8. University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska
(P. K. Pratt, A. K. Stipek, W. Koenig)
S. J. Marsden, Coach
9. Michigan State College, E. Lansing, Michigan
(D. Kline, E. Bjornseth, F. Riede)
G. G. Card, Coach
10. North Dakota Agricultural College, Fargo, N. Dakota
(F. E. Moore, O. G. Ash, R. Stendi)
O. A. Barton, Coach

INDIVIDUAL PLACINGS (All-around)

- | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. L. E. Melia, Kansas | 6. G. Bryan, Missouri |
| 2. M. Maxted, Ames | 7. E. E. Schnetzler, Missouri |
| 3. W. M. Mann, Kansas | 8. E. Moore, Ohio |
| 4. D. J. Carter, Ames | 9. D. M. Young, Missouri |
| 5. S. Paisley, Ohio | 10. S. I. Stratton, Jr., Texas |

TEAM PLACINGS

Seventh Annual Judging Contest
Chicago - December 11, 1928

1. Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa
(M. Maxted, G. L. Hall, D. J. Oster)
H. A. Bittenbender, Coach
2. University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri
(E. E. Schaefer, D. M. Young, G. Bryan)
E. W. Henderson, Coach
3. Kansas State Agricultural College, Manhattan, Kansas
(W. M. Mann, L. E. Meigs, V. M. Hooker)
W. E. Stearns, Coach
4. Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
(H. W. Kennedy, S. Paisley, E. Moore)
E. L. Dakan, Coach
5. Oklahoma A. and M. College, Stillwater, Oklahoma
(L. Kilpatrick, A. Chase, W. Miller)
Robert Pennington, Coach
6. Texas A. and M. College, College Station, Texas
(S. I. Stratton, Jr., J. B. Kiser, O. J. Hansen)
D. F. Irving, Coach
7. Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana
(G. Barge, M. Hart, J. Eastman)
L. H. Schwartz, Coach
8. University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska
(F. R. Pratt, A. K. Stipek, W. Koenig)
S. J. Marsden, Coach
9. Michigan State College, E. Lansing, Michigan
(D. Kline, E. Bjornseth, F. Riede)
G. G. Gird, Coach
10. North Dakota Agricultural College, Fargo, N. Dakota
(T. E. Moore, O. G. Ash, R. Stenlid)
O. A. Barton, Coach

INDIVIDUAL PLACINGS (All-around)

1. L. E. Meigs, Kansas
2. M. Maxted, Ames
3. W. M. Mann, Kansas
4. D. J. Oster, Ames
5. S. Paisley, Ohio
6. G. Bryan, Missouri
7. E. E. Schaefer, Missouri
8. E. Moore, Ohio
9. D. M. Young, Missouri
10. S. I. Stratton, Jr., Texas

1926

		EXHIBITION						Exhibition Score	Placing
		Correct placing	5 10 1-2-3-4	5 10 3-2-1-4	5 10 3-4-1-2	10 4-3-1-2	10 10 3-4-2-1		
Team	No.	Name of Individual	Wyam. Pullets	B. R. Pullets	R.I.Red Pullets	R.I.Red Cock'ls	W.L. Cock'ls		
NEBRASKA	1	Pratt, P.K.	70 3-1-2-4	55 1-3-4-2	95 4-3-1-2	90 4-1-3-2	45 1-3-2-4	355	
	2	Stipek, A. K.	65 3-2-1-4	40 1-4-3-2	80 4-3-2-1	90 4-1-3-2	70 4-2-3-1	345	
	3	Koenig, Wm. Team	70 205	70 165	100 275	70 250	55 170	365 1065	5
	4	Barge, G.	95 1-3-2-4	40 1-4-3-2	95 4-3-1-2	70 4-2-3-1	85 3-4-1-2	385	7
PURDUE	5	Hart, M.	95 1-3-2-4	45 1-2-4-3	80 4-3-2-1	60 4-2-1-3	85 3-4-1-2	365	
	6	Eastman, J. Team	65 255	70 155	70 245	100 230	60 230	365 1115	3
	7	Stratton, S.I.Jr.	100 1-2-3-4	70 1-3-2-4	55 4-2-3-1	85 4-3-2-1	45 1-4-3-2	355	
	8	Kiber, J.B.	70 3-1-2-4	70 1-3-2-4	80 4-3-2-1	70 4-1-2-3	70 2-3-4-1	360	
TEXAS	9	Hanszen, O.J. Team	50 220	35 175	80 215	90 245	60 175	315 1030	8
	10	Kline, D.	70 3-1-2-4	55 1-3-4-2	95 4-3-1-2	90 4-1-3-2	55 2-3-1-4	365	
	11	Bjornseth, E.	65 3-2-1-4	55 4-3-2-1	35 1-2-4-3	90 4-1-3-2	100 3-4-2-1	345	
	12	Biede, F. Team	85 220	45 155	70 200	85 265	25 180	310 1020	10
NORTH DAKOTA	13	Moore, F.E.	95 1-3-2-4	70 1-3-2-4	90 3-1-4-2	90 4-1-3-2	40 2-1-3-4	385	5
	14	Ash, C.G.	70 3-1-2-4	40 1-4-3-2	95 4-3-1-2	90 4-1-3-2	40 4-1-2-3	335	
	15	Stende, R. Team	65 230	45 155	70 255	85 265	70 150	335 1055	7
	16	Schnetzler, E.E.	70 3-1-2-4	70 3-1-4-2	55 4-1-2-3	85 4-3-2-1	85 3-4-1-2	365	
MISSOURI	17	Young, D.M.	70 3-1-2-4	70 1-3-2-4	95 4-3-1-2	70 4-3-1-2	75 3-2-4-1	380	8
	18	Bryan, S. Team	70 210	70 210	95 245	100 255	90 250	425 1170	1 2
	19	Kennedy, H.W.	70 3-1-2-4	100 3-2-1-4	95 4-3-1-2	55 3-1-2-4	70 3-2-1-4	390	4
	20	Paisley, S.	65 3-2-1-4	90 3-1-2-4	80 4-3-2-1	90 4-1-3-2	60 3-1-2-4	385	6
OHIO	21	Moore, E. Team	70 205	70 260	95 270	90 235	70 200	395 1170	3 1
	22	Kilpatrick, L.	70 3-1-2-4	45 3-1-2-4	95 1-4-3-2	70 4-3-1-2	45 3-2-1-4	325	
	23	Chase, A.	70 1-3-2-4	90 3-1-4-2	70 1-4-2-3	100 1-4-3-2	70 3-2-4-1	400	2
	24	Miller, W. Team	95 235	70 205	45 210	70 240	90 205	370 1095	10 4
AMES	25	Maxted, M.	95 1-3-2-4	55 4-3-1-2	70 4-3-1-2	70 4-1-2-3	70 1-4-3-2	360	
	26	Hall, C.L.	70 3-1-2-4	45 1-3-2-4	95 4-3-1-2	70 1-4-3-2	45 4-1-2-3	325	
	27	Carter, D.J. Team	70 235	70 170	95 260	70 210	40 155	345 1030	9
	28	Mann, W.M.	70 1-3-2-4	45 3-1-4-2	95 1-4-3-2	90 1-4-3-2	55 3-2-1-4	355	
KANSAS	29	Melia, L.E.	95 2-1-3-4	70 3-4-1-2	70 4-1-2-3	70 4-2-1-3	70 3-2-1-4	375	9
	30	Rucker, V.M. Team	85 250	60 175	55 220	60 220	70 195	330 1060	6
TOTALS			2265	1825	2395	2415	1910	10810	

1926

		PRODUCTION						Production Score	Placing
		Correct placing	3-1-4-2	4-1-3-2	5 2-3-4-1	10 2-3-1-4	10 2-1-4-3		
Team	No.	Name of Individual	Reds	Leghorn	W.P. Rocks	B.P. Rocks	Leghorn		
NEBRASKA	1	Pratt, P.K.	1-3-4-2 85	4-3-2-1 70	3-4-2-1 70	2-1-3-4 85	2-4-1-3 85	395	
	2	Stipek, A.K.	1-3-2-4 70	2-3-1-4 0	4-3-2-1 65	2-3-1-4 100	2-4-1-3 85	320	
	3	Koenig, Wm.	1-3-2-4 70	3-2-1-4 25	2-4-3-1 95	2-1-3-4 85	2-1-4-3 100	375	
		Team	225	95	230	270	270	1090	8
	4	Barge, G.	3-2-1-4 70	3-2-4-1 40	2-4-3-1 95	1-2-3-4 70	2-1-3-4 90	365	
	5	Hart, M.	3-2-1-4 70	3-2-4-1 40	2-3-4-1 100	2-1-3-4 85	2-1-3-4 90	385	
PURDUE	6	Eastman, J.	3-2-4-1 55	3-2-4-1 40	2-3-4-1 100	2-1-3-4 85	2-1-3-4 90	370	
		Team	195	120	295	240	270	1120	7
	7	Stratton, S.I.Jr.	3-1-4-2 100	3-2-4-1 40	2-4-3-1 95	1-2-3-4 70	2-1-4-3 100	405	10
	8	Kiber, J.B.	3-1-4-2 100	3-1-2-4 40	2-4-3-1 95	2-1-3-4 85	2-1-3-4 90	410	8
	9	Hanszen, O.J.	3-1-4-2 100	3-4-2-1 55	2-3-4-1 100	1-2-3-4 70	2-1-4-3 100	425	5
		Team	300	135	290	225	290	1240	2
TEXAS	10	Kline, D.	3-1-2-4 85	3-2-1-4 25	2-1-3-4 70	2-1-3-4 85	2-1-4-3 100	365	
	11	Bjornseth, E.	3-4-1-2 85	3-2-1-4 25	2-3-4-1 100	2-3-1-4 100	2-4-3-1 70	380	
	12	Riede, F.	3-4-1-2 85	2-3-1-4 0	2-3-1-4 85	1-2-3-4 70	2-1-4-3 100	340	
		Team	255	50	255	255	270	1085	9
	13	Moore, F.E.	3-2-4-1 55	3-2-1-4 25	2-1-3-4 70	2-1-3-4 85	4-1-2-3 55	290	
	14	Ash, C.G.	3-4-2-1 70	3-2-4-1 40	4-2-3-1 70	1-2-3-4 70	2-3-1-4 70	320	
NORTH DAKOTA	15	Stende, R.	4-2-3-1 40	3-2-1-4 25	1-2-4-3 50	1-2-3-4 70	1-3-2-4 55	240	
		Team	165	90	190	225	180	850	10
	16	Schnetzler, E.E.	3-1-2-4 85	3-4-1-2 70	2-4-3-1 95	1-2-3-4 70	2-1-4-3 100	420	6
	17	Young, D.M.	1-3-4-2 85	3-2-1-4 25	2-4-3-1 95	2-1-3-4 85	2-1-3-4 90	380	
	18	Bryan, S.	3-2-1-4 70	3-2-4-1 40	2-1-3-4 70	2-1-4-3 70	2-1-3-4 90	340	
		Team	240	135	260	225	280	1140	6
MISSOURI	19	Kennedy, H.W.	3-2-1-4 70	2-3-4-1 25	2-1-3-4 70	2-1-3-4 85	2-1-3-4 90	340	
	20	Paisley, S.	3-1-4-2 100	3-2-4-1 40	2-3-4-1 100	2-1-3-4 85	2-1-3-4 90	415	7
	21	Moore, E.	3-1-4-2 100	2-3-4-1 25	2-3-4-1 100	1-2-3-4 70	2-1-3-4 90	385	
		Team	270	90	270	240	270	1140	5
	22	Kilpatrick, L.	3-1-4-2 100	3-1-2-4 40	2-4-3-1 95	1-2-4-3 70	2-1-4-3 100	405	
	23	Chase, A.	1-3-4-2 85	3-2-4-1 40	3-2-4-1 85	1-2-3-4 70	2-1-4-3 100	380	
OKLAHOMA	24	Miller, W.	3-1-2-4 85	3-2-1-4 25	2-4-3-1 95	2-1-3-4 85	1-2-3-4 75	365	
		Team	270	105	275	225	275	1150	4
	25	Maxted, M.	3-1-4-2 100	3-4-1-2 70	2-4-3-1 95	2-3-1-4 100	2-1-4-3 100	465	1
	26	Hall, C.L.	3-1-4-2 100	3-2-1-4 25	2-4-3-1 95	2-1-3-4 85	2-1-4-3 100	405	9
	27	Carter, D.J.	3-1-4-2 100	3-2-4-1 40	2-3-4-1 100	2-1-3-4 85	2-1-4-3 100	425	4
		Team	300	135	290	270	300	1295	1
OHIO	28	Mann, W.M.	3-1-4-2 100	4-3-1-2 85	3-2-4-1 85	3-1-2-4 70	2-1-4-3 100	440	2
	29	Melia, L.E.	3-1-4-2 100	4-1-2-3 85	2-4-3-1 95	3-1-2-4 70	2-1-3-4 90	440	3
	30	Rucker, V.M.	1-3-4-2 85	4-3-2-1 70	4-2-3-1 70	1-3-2-4 60	2-4-3-1 70	355	
		Team	285	240	250	200	260	1235	3
		TOTALS	2505	1195	2605	2375	2665	11345	

SUMMARY

Team	No.	Name of Individual	Exhibition Score	Placing	Production Score	Placing	Written Exam.	Placing	Total Final Score	Final Place
NEBRASKA	1	Pratt, P.K.	355		395		240.0		990.0	
	2	Stipek, A.K.	345		320		273.3		938.3	
	3	Koenig, Wm. Team	365 1065	5	375 1090	8	253.3 766.6	8	993.3 2921.6	8
PURDUE	4	Barge, G.	385	7	365		280.0		1030.0	
	5	Hart, M.	365		385		256.7		1006.7	
	6	Eastman, J. Team	365 1115	3	370 1120	7	290.0 826.7	6	1025.0 3061.7	7
TEXAS	7	Stratton, S.I.Jr.	355		405	10	293.3	9	1053.3	10
	8	Kiber, J.B.	360		410	8	266.7		1036.7	
	9	Hanszen, O.J. Team	315 1030	8	425 1240	5 2	266.7 826.7	6	1006.7 3096.7	6
MICHIGAN	10	Kline, D.	365		365		223.3		953.3	
	11	Bjornseth, E.	345		380		256.7		981.7	
	12	Riede, F. Team	310 1020	10	340 1085	9	253.3 733.3	9	903.3 2838.3	9
NORTH DAKOTA	13	Moore, F.E.	385	5	290		230.0		905.0	
	14	Ash, C.G.	335		320		226.7		881.7	
	15	Stende, R. Team	335 1055	7	240 850	10	206.7 663.4	10	781.7 2568.4	10
MISSOURI	16	Schnetzler, E.E.	365		420	6	290.0		1075.0	7
	17	Young, D.M.	380	8	380		296.7	6	1056.7	9
	18	Bryan, S. Team	425 1170	1 2	340 1140	6	310.0 896.7	1 2	1075.0 3206.7	6 2
OHIO	19	Kennedy, H.W.	390	4	340		276.7		1006.7	
	20	Paisley, S.	385	6	415	7	280.0		1080.0	5
	21	Moore, E. Team	395 1170	3 1	385 1140	5	293.3 850.0	9 5	1073.3 3160.0	8 4
OKLAHOMA	22	Kilpatrick, L.	325		405		303.3	4	1033.3	
	23	Chase, A.	400	2	380		253.3		1033.3	
	24	Miller, W. Team	370 1095	10 4	365 1150	4	296.7 853.3	6 4	1031.7 3098.3	5
AMES	25	Maxted, M.	360		465	1	286.7		1111.7	2
	26	Hall, C.L.	325		405	9	290.0		1020.0	
	27	Carter, D.J. Team	345 1030	9	425 1295	1	310.0 886.7	1 3	1080.0 3211.7	4 1
KANSAS	28	Mann, W.M.	355		440	2	296.7	6	1091.7	3
	29	Melia, L.E.	375	9	440	3	303.3	4	1118.3	1
	30	Rucker, V.M. Team	330 1060	6	355 1235	3	306.7 906.7	3 1	991.7 3201.7	3
TOTALS			16810 10810		11345		8210.1		30365.1	

8th ANNUAL INTERCOLLEGIATE POULTRY JUDGING CONTEST

Chicago, Illinois - December 3, 1927

Institution

University of Illinois
University of Arizona
Purdue University
Texas A & M College
Iowa State College
Oklahoma A & M College
University of Missouri
Kansas State Agr. College
Ohio State University
North Dakota Agr. College

Coach

Professor E. W. Henderson
Professor H. Embleton
Professor L. H. Schwartz
Professor D. F. Irving
Professor C. W. Knox
Professor Robert Penquite
Professor E. M. Funk
Professor H. H. Steup
Professor E. L. Dakan
Professor O. A. Barton

University of Illinois Winning Team

Front row: E. H. Booker; M. O. North; H. P. Ringler
Back row: L. E. Card, Dept. Head; L. A. Clark; P. J. Zerbolio;
E. W. Henderson, Coach



Eighth Midwest Intercollegiate

Poultry Judging Contest

1927

Packet contains:

1. Minutes of coaches meeting December 3, 1927.
2. Sponsors and financial statement.
3. Letter to coaches regarding trophies and cash donations.

Make-up of Contest:

Exhibition Judging - Five four-bird rings

White Wyandotte Pullets
Barred Plymouth Rock Pullets
Rhode Island Red Pullets
Rhode Island Red Cockerels
White Leghorn Cockerels

Production Judging - Five four-bird rings

Barred Plymouth Rock Yearling Hens
White Plymouth Rock Yearling Hens
Rhode Island Red Yearling Hens
White Leghorn Yearling Hens
White Wyandotte Yearling Hens

Written Examination -

Questions on American Standard of Perfection

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

December 7, 1927

To the Coaches of the Judging Teams:

In order that there may be no question in your minds as to the source of the several prizes awarded in connection with this year's contest I am writing to state the facts for your information.

The Challenge Cup of course was donated by the Midwest Poultry and Egg Shippers when the contest idea was started in 1920. Mr. W. F. Friebe was the man who secured the money for purchasing this trophy.

The \$25.00 cup awarded to the best team in exhibition judging was donated by the Keyes-Davis Company of Battle Creek, Michigan.

The \$35.00 cup awarded to the best team in production judging was donated by the Poultry Tribune of Mount Morris, Illinois.

The gold medals awarded to the members of the winning team were donated by the Collis Products Company of Clinton, Iowa.

The gold, silver and bronze medals for the three high individuals in exhibition judging were donated by the G. E. Conkey Company of Cleveland, Ohio.

The corresponding set of medals awarded to the three high individuals in production judging were donated by the Albert Dickinson Company of Chicago.

Three gold medals representing a donation of \$50.00, while the other two sets represent a donation of \$35.00 each.

The cash awarded to the ten high individuals in all-round judging was donated as follows: Queen Incubator Company, Lincoln, Nebraska, \$50; James Manufacturing Company, Fort Atkinson, Wisconsin, \$50; Coliseum Show Management, \$25.

The \$22.50 awarded to the three high men in the written examination represented the cash balance on hand from last year plus a contribution of \$2.50 from A. G. Philips made just before the banquet in order to make possible the awarding of \$7.50 to each of the three boys who tied for first place in the written examination.

Very truly yours,

L. E. Card
MPS

Professor of Poultry Husbandry

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

December 7, 1927

To the Coaches of the Judging Teams:

In order that there may be no question in your minds as to the source of the several prizes awarded in connection with this year's contest I am writing to state the facts for your information.

The Challenge Cup of course was donated by the Midwest Poultry and Egg Shippers when the contest idea was started in 1926. Mr. F. F. Friebe was the man who secured the money for purchasing this trophy.

The \$25.00 cup awarded to the best team in exhibition judging was donated by the Hayes-Davis Company of Battle Creek, Michigan.

The \$35.00 cup awarded to the best team in production judging was donated by the Poultry Tribune of Mount Morris, Illinois.

The gold medals awarded to the members of the winning team were donated by the Collins Production Company of Clinton, Iowa.

The gold, silver and bronze medals for the three high individuals in exhibition judging were donated by the C. E. Conkey Company of Cleveland, Ohio.

The corresponding set of medals awarded to the three high individuals in production judging were donated by the Albert Dickinson Company of Chicago.

Three gold medals representing a donation of \$60.00, while the other two sets represent a donation of \$35.00 each.

The cash awarded to the ten high individuals in all-round judging was donated as follows: Queen Incubator Company, Lincoln, Nebraska, \$50; James Manufacturing Company, Fort Atkinson, Wisconsin, \$30; Collins Show Management, \$25.

The \$32.50 awarded to the three high men in the written examination represented the cash balance on hand from last year plus a contribution of \$2.50 from A. G. Phillips made just before the contest in order to make possible the awarding of \$7.50 to each of the three boys who tied for first place in the written examination.

Very truly yours,

Professor of Poultry Husbandry

L. E. Gans
MPS

FINANCIAL STATEMENT
1927 Poultry Judging Contest

- - - - -

Receipts

Balance on hand from 1926	\$18.31
Collis Products Company	50.00
Albert Dickinson Company	35.00
G. E. Conkey Company	35.00
Keyes-Davis Company	35.00
Poultry Tribune	35.00
Queen Incubator Company	50.00
James Manufacturing Company	50.00
Coliseum Show Management	25.00
	\$333.31

Expenditures

9 medals and engraving	\$120.49
2 cups and engraving	67.18
Cash prizes	145.00
Incidental expense	.64
	\$333.31

Meeting of Coaches

December 3, 1927

After the judging contest banquet at the Auditorium Hotel a meeting of the coaches was held to discuss plans for next year's contest. On motion the following decisions were reached:

1. That a contest be held next year at the Coliseum Show in Chicago.
2. That the same general plan of organization and procedure be followed as in this year's contest.
3. That A. G. Philips continue to act as manager of the contest.
4. That H. A. Bittenbender continue to act as chairman of the grading committee.
5. That H. H. Steup continue to act as chairman of the committee on written examination.
6. That E. L. Dakan be made chairman of the committee on prizes.
7. That the coaches be asked to use more care in making out questions to be submitted for use in the written examination.
8. That an effort be made to secure a suitable trophy for the team making the best score in the written examination.

L. E. Card

Secretary, pro tem.

TEAM PLACINGS

Eighth Annual Judging Contest

Chicago, December 11, 1927

	Score
1. University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois (M. O. North, E. Booker, H. R. Ringler) E. W. Henderson, Coach	2961.7
2. University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona (N. Pearce, L. Young, E. J. Finch) H. Embleton, Coach	2940.0
3. Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana (C. K. Noblitt, G. K. Napier, D. Sutherlin) L. H. Schwartz, Coach	2868.3
4. Texas A. & M. College, College Station, Texas (J. M. Hancock, F. C. Willard, V. F. Fitzhugh) D. F. Irving, Coach	2858.4
5. Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa (Wm. Kohlmeyer, M. Olsen, D. Brazie) C. W. Knox, Coach	2855.0
6. Oklahoma A. & M. College, Stillwater, Oklahoma (J. H. Rogers, H. Wright, C. Roberts) R. Penquite, Coach	2834.9
7. University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri (E. Halbrook, T. V. Davis, R. Sneed) E. M. Funk, Coach	2803.4
8. Kansas State Agr. College, Manhattan, Kansas (J. R. Wells, L. J. Simmons, A. W. Miller) H. H. Steup, Coach	2765.0
9. Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio (G. E. Wood, J. H. Schaad, J. H. Florea) E. L. Dakan, Coach	2750.1
10. North Dakota Agr. College, Fargo, North Dakota (H. G. Lewis, L. A. Reiten, R. B. Widdifield) O. A. Barton, Coach	2665.0

INDIVIDUAL PLACINGS

(All around)

1. M. O. North, Illinois, 1040	5. L. J. Finch, Arizona, 1008.3
2. F. C. Willard, Texas, 1025	6. D. Brazie, Iowa 1003.3
3. N. Pearce, Arizona 1010	7. A. W. Miller, Kansas 996.7
4. C. K. Noblitt, Purdue 1010	8. J. H. Florea, Ohio 986.7
	9. D. Sutherlin, Purdue 978.3
	10. H. Wright, Oklahoma 978.3

Teams

1.	Oklahoma	1080
2.	Arizona	1010
3.	North Dakota	965
4.	Ohio	950
5.	Purdue	950
6.	Illinois	860
7.	Iowa	860
8.	Kansas	845
9.	Texas	825
10.	Missouri	745

Individuals

1.	J. H. Rogers, Oklahoma	395
2.	N. Pearce, Arizona	375
3.	M. O. North, Illinois	375
4.	C. Roberts, Oklahoma	365
5.	C. K. Noblitt, Purdue	345
6.	J. H. Florea, Ohio	340
7.	D. Sutherlin, Purdue	340
8.	RR. B. Widdifield, North Dakota	340
9.	H. G. Lewis, North Dakota	340
10.	L. J. Finch, Arizona	325

Teams

1.	Arizona	1200
2.	Illinois	1185
3.	Texas	1160
4.	Missouri	1155
5.	Ohio	1100
6.	Iowa	1095
7.	Purdue	1095
8.	Oklahoma	1045
9.	Kansas	980
10.	North Dakota	890

Individuals

1.	E. Booker, Illinois	425
2.	N. Pearce, Arizona	425
3.	F. C. Willard, Texas	410
4.	L. J. Finch, Arizona	410
5.	J. H. Florea, Ohio	400
6.	H. R. Ringler, Illinois	395
7.	E. Halbrook, Missouri	395
8.	C. K. Noblitt, Purdue	395
9.	V. F. Fitzhugh, Texas	395
10.	H. Wright, Oklahoma	385

Teams

1.	Kansas	940.0
2.	Illinois	916.7
3.	Missouri	903.4
4.	Iowa	900.0
5.	Texas	873.4
6.	Purdue	823.3
7.	North Dakota	810.0
8.	Arizona	730.0
9.	Oklahoma	709.9
10.	Ohio	700.1

Individuals

1.	(E. Booker, Illinois	316.7
1.	(A. W. Miller, Kansas	316.7
	(R. Sneed, Missouri	316.7
	(D. Brazie, Iowa	313.3
4.	(J. R. Wells, Kansas	313.3
	(L. J. Simmons, Kansas	310.0
6.	(F.G. Willard, Texas	310.0
	(T. V. Davis, Missouri	300.0
	(Wm. Kohlmeyer, Iowa	300.0
8.	(M. O. North, Illinois	300.0
	(H. R. Ringler, Illinois	300.0

Team	No.	Name of Individual	Exhibit Score	Placing	Product Score	Placing	Written Exam.	Placing	Total Final Score	Final P (individual)	Final P (team)
ILLINOIS	1	North, M. O.	375	3	365		300.0	8	1040.0	1	
	2	Booker, E.	220		425	1	316.7	1	961.7		
	3	Ringler, H. R.	265		395	6	300.0	8	960.0		
		Team	860	6	1185	2	916.7	2	2961.7		1
ARIZONA	4	Pearce, N.	375	2	425	2	210.0		1010.0	3	
	5	Young, L.	310		365		246.7		921.7		
	6	Finch, L. J.	325	10	410	4	273.3		1008.3	5	
		Team	1010	2	1200	1	730.0	8	2940.0		2
PURDUE	7	Noblitt, C. K.	345	5	395	8	270.0		1010.0	4	
	8	Napier, G. K.	265		335		280.0		880.0		
	9	Sutherlin, D.	340	7	365		273.3		978.3	9	
		Team	950	5	1095	7	823.3	6	2868.3		3
NORTH DAKOTA	10	Lewis, H. G.	340	9	310		243.3		893.3		
	11	Reiten, L. A.	235		275		280.0		840.0		
	12	Widdifield, R. B.	340	8	305		286.7		931.7		
		Team	965	3	890	10	810.0	7	2665.0		10
OKLAHOMA	13	Rogers, J. H.	395	1	340		203.3		938.3		
	14	Wright, H.	320		385	10	273.3		978.3	10	
	15	Roberts, C.	365	4	320		233.3		918.3		
		Team	1080	1	1045	8	709.9	9	2834.9		6
KANSAS	16	Wells, J. R.	265		335		313.3	4	913.3		
	17	Simmons, L. J.	265		280		310.0	6	855.0		
	18	Miller, A. W.	315		365		316.7	1	996.7	7	
		Team	845	8	980	9	940.0	1	2765.0		8
OHIO	19	Wood, G. E.	310		320		226.7		856.7		
	20	Schaad, J. H.	300		380		226.7		906.7		
	21	Florea, J. H.	340	6	400	5	246.7		986.7	8	
		Team	950	4	1100	5	700.1	10	2750.1		9
MISSOURI	22	Halbrook, E.	245		395	7	286.7		926.7		
	23	Davis, T. V.	225		380		300.0	8	905.0		
	24	Sneed, R.	275		380		316.7	1	971.7		
		Team	745	10	1155	4	903.4	3	2803.4		7
TEXAS	25	Hancock, J. M.	295		355		266.7		916.7		
	26	Willard, F. C.	305		410	3	310.0	6	1025.0	2	
	27	Fitzhugh, V. F.	225		395	9	296.7		916.7		
		Team	825	9	1160	3	873.4	5	2858.4		4
AMES	28	Kohlmeyer, Wm.	235		365		300.0	8	900.0		
	29	Olsen, M.	300		365		286.7		951.7		
	30	Brazie, D.	325		365		313.3	4	1003.3	6	
		Team	860	7	1095	6	900.0	4	2855.0		5
TOTALS			9090		10905		8306.8		28301.8		

		Name of	B. P.	White	R. I.	W. Leg-	White	Score	Placings
Team	No.	Individual	Rocks	F. Rocks	Reds	horns	Wyand.		
ILLINOIS	1	North, M. O.	2-1-3-4 85	4-3-2-1 85	2-3-4-1 55	4-2-3-1 85	4-2-3-1 55	365	
	2	Booker, E.	2-1-3-4 85	4-3-1-2 100	4-3-2-1 70	4-3-2-1 100	2-3-1-4 70	425	1
	3	Ringler, H. R.	3-2-1-4 55	4-3-1-2 100	3-4-2-1 55	4-3-2-1 100	2-4-1-3 85	395	6
		Team	225	285	180	285	210	1185	2
ARIZONA	4	Pearce, N.	1-2-3-4 100	4-3-2-1 85	4-3-2-1 70	4-3-1-2 85	2-4-1-3 85	425	2
	5	Young, L.	3-2-4-1 40	4-1-3-2 85	3-4-2-1 55	4-2-3-1 85	2-1-4-3 100	365	
	6	Finch, L. J.	1-3-2-4 85	4-2-3-1 70	4-3-2-1 70	4-2-3-1 85	2-1-4-3 100	410	4
		Team	225	240	195	255	285	1200	1
PURDUE	7	Noblitt, C. K.	2-3-1-4 70	4-1-2-3 70	4-3-2-1 70	4-2-3-1 85	2-1-4-3 100	395	8
	8	Napier, G. K.	1-4-3-2 55	1-4-2-3 55	3-4-2-1 55	4-2-3-1 85	2-1-3-4 85	335	
	9	Sutherland, D.	1-2-4-3 85	1-4-2-3 55	3-4-2-1 55	4-2-3-1 85	2-1-3-4 85	365	
		Team	210	180	180	255	270	1095	7
NORTH DAKOTA	10	Lewis, H. G.	3-2-4-1 40	4-2-1-3 55	1-2-4-3 60	4-3-2-1 100	2-3-4-1 55	310	
	11	Reiten, L. A.	2-3-4-1 55	4-2-1-3 55	3-1-4-2 25	4-1-3-2 170	2-3-1-4 70	275	
	12	Widdifield, R.B.	3-2-4-1 40	1-3-2-4 40	4-1-3-2 70	4-3-1-2 85	4-2-1-3 70	305	
		Team	135	150	155	255	195	890	10
OKLAHOMA	13	Rogers, J. H.	3-2-4-1 40	4-3-2-1 85	4-1-2-3 90	4-3-2-1 100	3-4-2-1 25	340	
	14	Wright, H.	2-1-3-4 85	4-3-2-1 85	3-4-1-2 45	4-2-3-1 85	2-4-1-3 85	385	10
	15	Roberts, C.	2-3-1-4 70	3-4-2-1 70	2-1-3-4 55	4-2-3-1 85	3-1-2-4 40	320	
		Team	195	240	190	270	150	1045	8
KANSAS	16	Wells, J. R.	3-2-1-4 55	1-4-2-3 55	1-4-2-3 70	4-2-3-1 85	2-3-1-4 70	335	
	17	Simmons, L. J.	3-2-4-1 40	1-4-2-3 55	4-3-1-2 60	4-2-1-3 70	3-2-1-4 55	280	
	18	Miller, A. W.	2-1-3-4 85	4-1-3-2 85	2-1-4-3 70	4-2-3-1 85	3-2-4-1 40	365	
		Team	180	195	200	240	165	980	9
OHIO	19	Wood, G. E.	4-1-2-3 55	3-2-4-1 55	1-3-2-4 25	4-2-3-1 85	2-1-4-3 100	320	
	20	Schaad, J. H.	1-2-3-4 100	4-3-1-2 100	3-4-2-1 55	4-1-3-2 70	2-3-4-1 55	380	
	21	Florea, J. H.	2-3-1-4 70	4-1-3-2 85	4-3-1-2 60	4-2-3-1 85	2-1-4-3 100	400	5
		Team	225	240	140	240	255	1100	5
MISSOURI	22	Halbrook, E.	2-1-3-4 85	4-3-1-2 100	2-3-1-4 40	4-3-2-1 100	2-3-1-4 70	395	7
	23	Davis, T. V.	1-2-3-4 100	4-3-1-2 100	3-1-4-2 25	4-3-2-1 100	2-3-4-1 55	380	
	24	Sneed, R.	1-2-4-3 85	4-1-2-3 70	4-3-2-1 70	4-1-3-2 70	2-1-3-4 85	380	
		Team	270	270	135	270	210	1155	4
TEXAS	25	Hancock, J. M.	3-1-2-4 70	4-3-1-2 100	3-4-1-2 45	4-1-3-2 70	2-4-3-1 70	355	
	26	Willard, F. C.	2-3-1-4 70	4-3-1-2 100	4-3-2-1 70	4-2-1-3 70	2-1-4-3 100	410	3
	27	Fitzhugh, V.F.	2-1-3-4 85	4-3-1-2 100	4-3-2-1 70	4-2-1-3 70	2-4-3-1 70	395	9
		Team	225	300	185	210	240	1160	3
AMES	28	Kohlmeyer, Wm.	1-2-3-4 100	4-1-2-3 70	1-3-2-4 25	4-3-2-1 100	1-2-3-4 70	365	
	29	Olsen, M.	1-2-3-4 100	4-1-3-2 85	3-1-4-2 25	4-1-3-2 70	2-1-3-4 85	365	
	30	Brazie, D.	2-1-3-4 85	4-3-1-2 100	3-2-1-4 25	4-1-3-2 70	2-1-3-4 85	365	
		Team	285	255	75	240	240	1095	6
TOTALS			2175	2355	1635	2520	2220	10905	

EXHIBITION

		Correct placing	10 5 5 2-3-4-1	10 5 5 1-2-3-4	10 5 5 2-3-4-1	5 5 5 1-4-2-3	10 5 5 2-3-4-1		
Team	No.	Name of Individual	W. Wyan. Pullets	B. F. R. Pullets	R. I. Red Ckls.	W. Leg. Cocks	R. I. Red Pullets		
ILLINOIS	1	North, M. O.	4-1-3-2 30	1-2-3-4 100	3-2-4-1 90	2-4-1-3 75	3-2-1-4 80	375	3
	2	Booker, E.	1-4-2-3 35	4-2-3-1 25	3-4-2-1 70	3-2-1-4 35	3-1-2-4 55	220	
	3	Ringler, H. R.	4-1-3-2 30	1-3-4-2 70	3-4-2-1 70	3-4-2-1 25	3-4-2-1 70	265	
		Team	95	195	230	135	205	860	6
ARIZONA	4	Pearce, N.	4-3-1-2 50	1-2-4-3 95	2-3-4-1 100	2-4-3-1 50	3-2-1-4 80	375	2
	5	Young, L.	1-3-4-2 25	1-2-4-3 95	3-4-2-1 70	1-3-2-4 75	3-1-4-2 45	310	
	6	Finch, L. J.	4-1-3-2 30	1-2-3-4 100	3-2-4-1 90	4-3-1-2 55	1-2-4-3 50	325	10
		Team	105	290	260	180	175	1010	2
PURDUE	7	Noblitt, C. K.	4-1-3-2 30	1-2-3-4 100	3-2-4-1 90	2-1-4-3 70	3-4-1-2 55	345	5
	8	Napier, G. K.	4-1-3-2 30	4-2-3-1 25	4-3-2-1 60	4-1-2-3 95	3-4-1-2 55	265	
	9	Sutherlin, D.	1-4-2-3 35	1-2-4-3 95	4-2-3-1 70	1-3-4-2 70	2-1-3-4 70	340	7
		Team	95	220	220	235	180	950	5
NORTH DAKOTA	10	Lewis, H. G.	2-1-3-4 70	3-4-1-2 40	4-3-2-1 60	4-1-3-2 90	3-2-1-4 80	340	9
	11	Reiten, L. A.	4-1-3-2 40	4-3-1-2 35	4-2-3-1 70	4-1-2-3 95	3-1-4-2 45	285	
	12	Widdifield, R. B.	2-1-4-3 75	3-2-1-4 70	2-4-3-1 95	4-2-1-3 70	1-4-2-3 30	340	8
		Team	185	145	225	255	155	965	3
OKLAHOMA	13	Rogers, J. H.	4-3-1-2 50	1-2-3-4 100	2-3-1-4 95	2-1-4-3 70	3-2-1-4 80	395	1
	14	Wright, H.	4-1-2-3 40	3-2-1-4 70	3-2-1-4 85	1-2-3-4 70	4-2-1-3 55	320	
	15	Roberts, C.	4-3-2-1 60	3-4-2-1 30	3-2-4-1 90	1-2-4-3 95	2-3-1-4 90	365	4
		Team	150	200	270	235	225	1080	1
KANSAS	16	Wells, J. R.	4-1-3-2 30	3-1-4-2 55	3-4-2-1 70	2-1-3-4 55	3-1-2-4 55	265	
	17	Simmons, L. J.	1-4-3-2 25	1-4-3-2 75	4-3-2-1 60	2-3-4-1 35	2-1-4-3 70	265	
	18	Miller, A. W.	1-3-2-4 45	2-1-3-4 90	3-4-2-1 70	2-1-3-4 55	3-4-1-2 55	315	
		Team	100	220	200	145	180	845	8
OHIO	19	Wood, G. E.	1-4-2-3 35	1-4-3-2 75	2-4-3-1 95	3-1-2-4 50	1-2-3-4 55	310	
	20	Schaad, J. H.	1-2-4-3 50	1-3-4-2 70	3-1-2-4 55	4-2-1-3 70	3-1-2-4 55	300	
	21	Florea, J. H.	4-1-3-2 30	1-2-3-4 100	2-4-3-1 95	4-1-3-2 90	1-3-4-2 25	340	6
		Team	115	245	245	210	135	950	4
MISSOURI	22	Halbrook, E.	1-4-3-2 25	4-3-2-1 25	3-2-1-4 85	2-1-3-4 55	3-1-2-4 55	245	
	23	Davis, T. V.	1-3-4-2 25	2-4-3-1 50	3-4-2-1 70	3-2-4-1 30	4-3-1-2 50	225	
	24	Sneed, R.	4-1-3-2 30	2-1-4-3 85	3-1-4-2 50	2-1-3-4 55	3-1-2-4 55	275	
		Team	80	160	205	140	160	745	10
TEXAS	25	Hancock, J. M.	1-4-2-3 35	1-3-4-2 70	3-4-2-1 70	2-3-1-4 40	3-2-1-4 80	295	
	26	Willard, F. C.	2-3-4-1 100	1-3-4-2 70	3-4-2-1 70	2-3-1-4 40	1-3-4-2 25	305	
	27	Fitzhugh, V. F.	1-3-4-2 25	4-1-3-2 50	3-4-2-1 70	3-2-1-4 35	1-3-2-4 45	225	
		Team	160	190	210	115	150	825	9
AMES	28	Kohlmeyer, Wm.	1-4-3-2 25	4-2-1-3 45	3-4-2-1 70	2-3-1-4 40	3-1-2-4 55	235	
	29	Olsen, M.	4-3-1-2 50	1-4-3-2 75	3-4-2-1 70	2-1-3-4 55	4-3-1-2 50	300	
	30	Brazie, D.	4-1-3-2 30	3-2-1-4 70	2-4-3-1 95	4-3-2-1 50	3-2-1-4 80	325	
		Team	105	190	235	145	185	860	7
TOTALS			1190	2055	2300	1795	1750	9090	

9th ANNUAL INTERCOLLEGIATE POULTRY JUDGING CONTEST

Chicago, Illinois - December 22, 1928

Institution

Iowa State College
Kansas State College
Oklahoma A & M College
Purdue University
University of Illinois
University of Missouri
Texas A & M College
University of Nebraska
North Dakota Agr. College
Ohio State University

Coach

Professor C. W. Knox
Professor H. M. Scott
Professor Robert Penquite
Professor L. H. Schwartz
Professor F. N. Barrett
Professor E. W. Henderson
Professor W. F. Munnerlyn
Professor S. J. Marsden
Professor O. A. Barton
Professor E. L. Dakan

Iowa State College Winning Team

D. G. Pendarvis; C. W. Knox, Instructor; Roy Bobb; R. F. Randolph;
Donald Brazie; Lewis Beagley



Ninth Midwest Intercollegiate

Poultry Judging Contest

1928

Packet contains:

1. Minutes of the coaches meeting December 21, 1928, Hotel New Southern. Professor H. A. Bittenbender, Iowa State College, acted as chairman for Prof. A. G. Phillips of Purdue University.
2. Minutes of the coaches meeting December 22, 1928, Hotel Auditorium.
3. List of the study questions for the examination portion of the contest.
4. Schedule of Marketing Inspection Tour.
5. Instructions to the coaches.

Make-up of Contest:

Exhibition Judging - Five four-bird rings

White Wyandotte Hens
Rhode Island Red Cockerels
White Leghorn Cockerels
Barred Plymouth Rock Hens
Rhode Island Red Pullets

Production Judging - Five four-bird rings

Barred Plymouth Rock Yearling Hens
White Wyandotte Yearling Hens
Rhode Island Red Yearling Hens
White Plymouth Rock Yearling Hens
White Leghorn Yearling Hens

Written Examination -

Questions on American Standard of Perfection

Meeting Called to Order

Hotel New Southern, Friday, December 21, 1928 - 6:30

All coaches present representing 10 schools.

1. Professor Bittenbender acting for A. G. Phillips as contest manager announced the exhibition classes to be used in judging:
1. S.C.R.I.R. cockerels; 2. S.C.R.I.R. pullet; 3. W. Wyat. Hens:
4. B.P.R. (light) hens; 5. S.C.W.Leg. cockerels.

The production classes were to be as scheduled.

It was announced that students should pay no attention to disqualification.

2. Dr. Card reported for the prize committee. (See his letter)
The cash prizes totaled about \$135.00
3. Drawings: - 1. Nebraska, 2. Iowa, 3. Oklahoma, 4. Illinois, 5. Missouri, 6. Ohio, 7. North Dakota, 8. Purdue, 9. Texas, 10. Kansas.
4. Classes one to five inclusive were exhibition classes, six to ~~twelve~~ were production. A student who started in on exhibition was to finish the exhibition classes and work similarly with the production classes.
5. Group number one was to start judging. Group number two and three was to take the examination while group one judged. While group two judged, group one took the examination. The alternates were given the opportunity of taking the examination with group one. The birds in all classes were banded, and a corresponding colored band was placed on the coop.
6. Instructions were to be given at 7:45 Saturday morning December 22. Judging was to start at 8:00.
7. Motion made by Prof. Knox was to the effect that the answers to the questions on the examination to be taken as final as given by the disinterested committee. Motion seconded by Prof. Barton. Motion carried.
8. Examination committee: - Steup, Schwartz, Penquitt, Scott.
9. Grades Committee:- Card, Henderson, Knox.
10. Transportation committee:- Barton, Mundenlin, Zumbro, Marsden, Barrett.

[illegible]

11. All grades were to be turned in to Prof. Bittenbender.
12. All questions at the time of examination were to be answered by Prof. Steup. It was decided that no remarks or interpretations be made by any monitor during the examination.
13. Price of tickets for banquet \$1.75
14. Motion made by Prof. Henderson, seconded by Prof. Barton, passed by the organization.

Motion: A clause be added to the eligibility rules providing that in case students of any particular race are not admitted to any one of the colleges which compete in the Mid-West contest that all such students shall not be eligible to compete in this contest.

15. An invitation was received from the mayor of St. Louis inviting the Mid-West Intercollegiate Judging Contest to his city next year. (See appointment of committees by contest manager.)
16. It was decided that a time warning be given at 10 minutes or five minutes before time was up and a final time warning of one minute before time was up.

11. All grades were to be turned in to Prof. Bistander.
12. All questions of the time of examination were to be answered by Prof. Bistander. It was decided that no remarks or interpretations be made by any monitor during the examination.
13. Prices of tickets for passage \$1.75
14. Motion made by Prof. Bistander, seconded by Prof. Bistander, passed by the organization.
15. Motion: A clause be added to the eligibility rules providing that in case students of any particular race are not admitted to any one of the colleges which compete in the Mid-west contest that all such students shall not be eligible to compete in this contest.
16. An invitation was received from the mayor of St. Louis inviting the Mid-west Intercollegiate Athletic Council to his city next year. (See explanation of committee by contest manager.)
17. It was decided that a time meeting be given at 10 minutes or five minutes before time was up and a final time warning of one minute before time was up.

Minutes of the Coaches Meeting Held at
the Hotel Auditorium Dec. 22, 1928

1. It was decided that there shall be a contest for next year.
2. Professor Bittenbender was elected contest manager. The chair was granted the power to appoint committees for the following year, namely; 1- Ex. 2, grading; 3, prize; 4, location. In addition to these four committees the chair was empowered to appoint a committee to decide upon a place for the contest next year.
3. The rules and regulations are to be revised and distributed by the location committee.
4. It was decided that the boys who won prizes should write to the various donators thanking them for their cooperation.
5. Professor Barton raised the question concerning the condition of the birds judged by the third man on a team as compared to the first man.
6. The Poultry Tribune offered the production birds for the next contest.
7. Quaker Oats Company offered the production birds for the next contest.
8. The place of securing birds was left to the contest managers.
9. Dr. O. B. Kent offered the suggestion that this organization consider the advisability of adding a meat class. The general idea being that the students would judge the birds alive and the birds would then be killed and dressed. It was thought that the packers of Chicago would enter whole heartily into such an enterprise. This question was put to a tentative vote, six were in favor, and three were opposed, namely Kansas, Iowa, and Oklahoma. Ohio was not present. The general idea seems to be that the coaches would like more information upon the specific question and the details for the conduct of same.
10. It was decided that all action with various plans should be decided upon and gotten out before June 1929.

Minutes of the Executive Meeting Held at
The Hotel Auditorium Dec. 22, 1932

1. It was decided that there shall be a contest for next year.
2. Professor Dittmer was elected contest manager. The chair was given the power to appoint managers for the following year, namely: 1- Mr. B. Gilling; 2, Gilling; 3, Gilling; 4, Gilling; 5, Gilling. In addition to these four managers the chair was empowered to appoint a committee to decide upon a place for the contest next year.
3. The rules and regulations are to be revised and distributed by the contest committee.
4. It was decided that the boys who win prizes should write to the various donors thanking them for their cooperation.
5. Professor Barton raised the question concerning the donation of the birds judged by the third man on a team as compared to the first man.
6. The poultry business offered the production birds for the next contest.
7. Quaker Oats Company offered the production birds for the next contest.
8. The place of securing birds was left to the contest manager.
9. Dr. O. B. Kent offered the suggestion that this organization consider the advisability of adding a meat class. The general idea being that the students would judge the birds alive and the birds would then be killed and dressed. It was thought that the members of Chicago would enter heavily into such an enterprise. This question was put to a tentative vote, six were in favor, and three were opposed, namely Kansas, Iowa, and Oklahoma. Ohio was not present. The general idea seems to be that the organization would like more information upon the specific question and the details for the conduct of same.
10. It was decided that all action with various places should be decided upon and gotten out before June 1933.

266
STUDY QUESTIONS COMPILED FOR STUDENT POULTRY JUDGES
BASED ON
THE AMERICAN STANDARD OF PERFECTION

1. Name the different systems used in judging poultry and describe them fully as you would use them in the show room.
2. What is meant by "class", "breed", and "variety"? Describe fully.
3. What is meant by the "Scale of Points" and for what purpose is it used?
4. Is there any difference between a parti-colored and a solid-colored fowl?
5. Which would you consider the most important in judging a show "shape" or "color"? Give a positive reason for your answer.
6. Would you handle every specimen in the show regardless of their quality or only just handle those that looked as if they might stand a chance to win? Why?
7. How would you determine in the show room whether or not a specimen was pure bred?
8. You are instructed in the Standard to make deductions from the score for under weight in certain varieties. How much would you deduct per pound in all varieties?
9. Are there any specimens that you would discount for overweight? If so, name all the breeds that you would discount for overweight.
10. Suppose you found a specimen that you thought had been faked but were not sure of it. What would you do in such a case?
11. Name and describe the different kinds of combs that are found in the Standard.
12. When judging a show, would you require the specimens to be weighed? If not, state reasons why.
13. Name all the varieties in the Standard that are white.
14. Is there any variety in the Standard with a "Rose Comb" that absence of a spike does not disqualify? If so, name the variety or varieties.
15. Name all the varieties in the Standard that are Barred.
16. Would the absence of a blade on a single comb disqualify? If so, why?
17. Describe or illustrate the following terms: bean, beak, bill, cushion, frosting, facing, poult, quill, serrations, shaft, shafting, side sprig, spangle, stippled, web, wry tail.
18. Name the disqualifications for Plymouth Rocks.
19. Give the disqualifications for Barred Rocks, excepting general disqualifications.

20. What are the highest valued sections in the Scale of Points for a Plymouth Rock?
21. What would you cut for two solid black feathers in primaries or secondaries of a Barred Rock?
22. Give the cut for a twisted wing feather in a Plymouth Rock.
23. Give the cut for a slipped wing in any breed;
24. What would you cut a White Plymouth for two missing sickle feathers?
25. If you had a Barred Rock cockerel weighing 7 1/2 lbs. and a Barred Rock pullet weighing 7 lbs. both tied in score for highest scoring Barred Rock, which would you award the prize, and why?
26. What premiums would you offer the following assuming each was the highest scoring specimen in the class: Light^t Brahma cock scoring 88 points; Buff Orpington cockerel scoring 89 points; R. I. Red hen scoring 87 points; Barred Rock pullet scoring 87 points.
27. How would you figure the score of an exhibition pen? Describe fully.
28. Is there any difference in your opinion between "creaminess" and "brassiness"? If so, describe fully.
29. Give all the disqualifications that apply to "Single Combs".
30. Give the cut for each serration more or less than the correct number. How much would you cut a rose comb that was perfect in every respect except having a smooth surface? How much would you cut for a telescoped spike on a rose comb? How much would you cut a split comb that was otherwise perfect?
31. How much would you cut a rose comb that fell over to one side far enough to touch the face or head? How much would you cut a single comb that showed on one side a small distinct scar? How much would you cut a single comb that had part of the blade cut or torn off? Would you disqualify all rose comb breeds that showed an entire absence of spike? If not, what breeds are they?
32. How much would you cut for a missing wattle in any variety?
33. If a Rose Comb had more than one spike, what^{would}/you cut it providing the rest of the comb was perfect?
34. If two cockerels of the same variety scored the same and weighed the same, how would you decide the tie?
35. Is there any difference between "Mealiness" and "Mossiness"?
36. Do any two classes in the Standard have the same "Scale of Points"?
37. Do any two "breeds" in the Standard have the same "Scale of Points"?

38. Do all breeds have a "Scale of Points"?
39. In judging the wing section, how do you apply the discounts, to the wing as a whole; or is the wing divided into sections?
40. How much would you discount for a missing feather in the primaries of a Barred Rock? White Wyandotte? Rhode Island Red?
41. How much would you discount for one blind eye in any variety?
42. Should there be any difference in the combs of a Rose Comb Rhode Island Red and a Wyandotte? If so, describe them.
43. If you found a Barred Rock cock with both sickles and four main tail feathers missing, what would you discount the tail section? Explain why you make that cut.
44. What are 8 rather common color defects found in Rhode Island Reds?
45. A Buff Leghorn has a perfect tail except that it is one-fourth black. How much would you discount the tail section?
46. How would you tell the difference between a R. I. Red and a Buckeye?
47. Are there any black varieties of fowls that should have yellow shanks or yellow feet? If so, name them all.
48. How much would you cut a cock for a missing spur, or a cock of any breed that had double or even triple spurs on each leg?
49. How much would you cut "web-feet" in any breed?
50. Is there any disqualification that applies to beaks? If so, name it.
51. Which would you give the greatest consideration in judging; surface color or under color?
52. What would you do in the show room with a specimen on which "scaly-leg" had destroyed the natural color?
53. Are there any breeds in the Standard in which the male is required to be "hen-feathered"? If so, what breed or breeds?
54. Some breeds have Crests, some have Beards, and some have Muffs. Is there any breed or breeds in the Standard that should have all three? If so, name the breed or breeds?
55. Are there any breeds in the Standard that "clipped-wing" does not disqualify? If so, name them.
56. How much would you discount the following for weight? R. I. Red cock weighing 6 lbs.; Buff Orpington cockerel weighing 8 lbs.; White Leghorn pullet weighing 2 1/2 lbs.; Dark Cornish cock weighing 9 3/4 lbs.
57. Give all the disqualifications for R. I. Reds.

77. Suppose you were judging a show and had the following specimens competing for the highest scoring bird in the show, a silver cup being offered for the prize, how would you make the award and why? Ancona pullet scoring $94 \frac{1}{2}$, White Wyandotte hen scoring $96 \frac{1}{4}$, White Holland Turkey pullet scoring $96 \frac{1}{2}$, Black Langshan cockerel scoring 96, Buff Orpington cock scoring $95 \frac{1}{4}$, White Leghorn cockerel $96 \frac{1}{2}$, and Single Comb R. I. Red hen scoring $94 \frac{1}{2}$.

78. State approximately the discount you would make on tail shape of males in the following varieties on tail carried at 70 degrees. Plymouth Rocks; Wyandottes; Rhode Island Reds; and White Leghorns.

79. Name the prizes you would give the following specimens provided they were the highest scoring birds in their class? Barred Rock cock scoring 83 points, Buff Orpington cock scoring 89 points, Silver Laced Wyandotte cockerel scoring 85 points, Brown Leghorn cockerel scoring 88 points, and Mottled Houdan cockerel scoring 87 points.

80. In a sweepstakes class you have the following specimens: a Black Orpington scoring 93 points, a White Plymouth Rock scoring 94 points, a Buff Wyandotte scoring $93 \frac{1}{2}$ points and a White Crested Black Polish scoring 93 points. Which would you place first, second and third and why?

81. Two R. I. Red cockerels are equal in score but one weighs six lbs. and the other seven lbs. Which would you place first and why?

82. Give all the disqualifications that apply to "Rose Combs".

83. There are several breeds of fowls in the Standard that have exactly the same color markings. Name all these varieties that are alike in color.

84. Barred Plymouth Rocks are sometimes called Dominiques? Is this correct or is there any difference between them? If any difference, describe fully.

85. In judging Buff varieties which do you prefer, a light or lemon colored Buff, a dark or cinnamon color, or a medium shade? State reason for your preference.

86. What is meant by the term "peppering"?

87. Name all the varieties in which "peppering" might be found.

88. Give all the ear-lobe disqualifications that apply to the different classes in the Standard.

89. Give all the disqualifications for "legs and toes" of all smooth legged varieties.

90. Are all "Penciled" feathers marked alike in all breeds? If not, name different markings of different breeds.

91. Is there any "Scale of Points" in which the term "stern" is used. If so, name it or them.

92. Sometimes the word "Station" is used in speaking of fowls. In connection with what breed or breeds is that term used?

93. Are there any breeds in the Standard that do not have a weight clause applied to them? If so, name them.

94. What are "Caruncles" and on what breeds are they found?

95. Is there any "Scale of Points" in the Standard in which "Symmetry" is not used? If so, name ^{any} them.

96. On what grounds may an exhibitor protest your awards?

97. Suppose another judge had judged a certain class and one of the exhibitors called you over and asked your opinion regarding the awards on the placing, what would you say?

98. There are certain rules for the protection of judges and their awards. Suppose you were judging a show and some exhibitor lodged a protest against your award. Describe fully just what he would have to do to comply with the rules of the American Poultry Association and also what steps you would take to protect your interests and your reputation in the matter.

99-100. Name breeds and varieties in Mediterranean and English classes.

92. Sometimes the word "Station" is used in speaking of fowls. In connection with what breed or breeds is that term used?

93. Are there any breeds in the Standard that do not have a weight clause applied to them? If so, name them.

94. What are "Carinales" and on what breeds are they found?

95. Is there any "Scale of Points" in the Standard in which "Symmetry" is not used? If so, name them.

96. On what grounds may an exhibitor protest your awards?

97. Suppose another judge had judged a certain class and one of the exhibitors called you over and asked your opinion regarding the awards on the placing, what would you say?

98. There are certain rules for the protection of judges and their awards. Suppose you were judging a show and some exhibitor lodged a protest against your award. Describe fully just what he would have to do to comply with the rules of the American Poultry Association and also what steps you would take to protect your interests and your reputation in the matter.

99-100. Name breeds and varieties in Mediterranean and English classes.

Schedule
of
Marketing Inspection Tour
for
Students Attending Mid-West Poultry Judging Contest

Chicago, Illinois

Date: Friday, December 21, 1928

Under auspices of United States Egg Society,
Poultry Research Society of America, and
Agricultural Committee, Chicago Chamber of
Commerce.

Morning:

Meet at New Southern Hotel - 6:45 a.m.

1. South Water Street Terminal Market
2. Chicago Poultry Board - 9:00 a.m.
3. Chicago Mercantile Exchange - 10:00 a.m.
4. Central Cold Storage Warehouse- 11:30 a.m.

Luncheon - Guests at Stevens or Sherman Hotel
12:30 p.m.

5. Program of short talks - list of topics and speakers
accompanies.

Afternoon:

6. Visit to kitchen of Stevens or Sherman Hotel.

Note: Copy of schedule will be left at offices of Priebe & Sons, Inc., and United States Egg Society in Mercantile Exchange Building, 110 North Franklin St. If any group arrives at Chicago after 7:00 a.m. on Friday, December 21st, they can get information from either office.

Program of Short Talks

at

Noon Luncheon

1. Welcome and Comments, Mr. W.F. Priebe, Priebe & Sons, Inc.
2. Markets and Marketing, Prof. W.D. Termohlen, Iowa State College.
3. The Function of the Poultry and Egg Packer and Shipper in the Poultry Industry, Mr. H.S. Johnson, Vice-President, Armour & Company.
4. Transportation and Its Relation to the Poultry Industry, Mr. Waldo P. Johnson, Live Poultry Transit Company.
5. The Function of the Cold Storage Warehouse in the Poultry Industry, Mr. L.B. Kilbourne, Central Cold Storage Company.
6. Market News Reporting, Mr. Gilbert Gusler, Agricultural News Service.
7. What the Consumer Wants in Eggs and Poultry, Prof. W.H. Lapp, Poultry Research Society.
8. The United States Egg Society, Mr. E.B. Heaton.
9. Thanks and Comment - A Student.

THE TOUR

Places Visited

1. South Water Street Terminal Market.

Trip thru this terminal market place to see how business is carried on, products handled, unloading from railroad tracks, etc.

This is probably the most modern and model market place in the country. It was built thru cooperative effort of a number of dealers.

2. Chicago Poultry Board.

To see the actual operation of such an exchange. We shall call on Mr. McNeil, the Business Manager of the Exchange, to describe the purpose, function, and structure of the Chicago Poultry Board.

3. Chicago Mercantile Exchange.

This is the outstanding Exchange building of the Poultry and Dairy Industry. Object of visit to see the actual operation of such an exchange. We shall ask an officer or employee of the exchange to describe the purpose, function, and structure of the Chicago Mercantile Exchange. Also there is being planned an egg exhibit of packs from various parts of the country.

Ask J.T. Milnarik, in charge of egg inspection service, to describe the inspection work of the exchange.

4. Central Cold Storage Warehouse.

To show the method of keeping eggs, poultry, and other products in cold storage. An exhibit of dressed poultry packs from various parts of the country and possibly some egg packs is being planned by the company.

5. Kitchen of Large Hotel.

To see preparation of products. We hope to have a steward or chef give a brief discussion and demonstration of kinds of poultry and eggs wanted by them and why. A list of daily requirements of eggs and poultry to be passed out to students.

December 31, 1928

To the Coaches of Poultry Judging Teams:

This letter is sent to give you information concerning the source of the several prizes awarded in connection with this year's judging contest.

The Challenge Cup of course was donated by the Mid-West Poultry and Egg Shippers when the contest idea was started in 1920. Mr. W. F. Priebe was the man who secured the money for purchasing this trophy.

The permanent trophy awarded to this year's winning team was donated by Purina Mills of St. Louis, Missouri.

The \$35 cup awarded to the best team in exhibition judging was donated by the Keyes-Davis Company of Battle Creek, Michigan.

The \$35 cup awarded to the best team in production judging was donated by ~~The "OK" Poultry Journal of Mounds, Oklahoma.~~

Poultry Tribune, Mt. Morris, Ill.
\$35 cups awarded to best team in written exam. by "OK" Poultry Journal of Mounds, Okla.

The gold medals awarded to the members of the winning all-around team were donated by the Collis Products Company of Clinton, Iowa. They represent a cost of \$50.

The gold, silver and bronze medals for the three high individuals in exhibition judging were donated by the G. E. Conkey Company of Cleveland, Ohio. They represent a value of \$35.

The gold, silver and bronze medals awarded to the three high individuals in the written examination were made possible through donations from the McMillen Company of Fort Wayne, Indiana, and the National Chick Advertising Service, Inc., 4750 Sheridan Road, Chicago.

The cash awarded to the ten high individuals in all-around judging was donated as follows: Queen Incubator Company, Lincoln, Nebraska, \$50; James Manufacturing Company, Fort Atkinson, Wisconsin, \$50; Coliseum Show Management, \$25; Buffalo Incubator Company, Buffalo, New York, \$10.

It will be a fine thing if each coach will write to the several donors expressing appreciation for the support which they have given to the contest. Will you also urge any of your boys who were winners of prizes at the contest to write to the donors concerned expressing their appreciation.

December 31, 1933

To the Coaches of Poultry Judging Teams:

This letter is sent to give you information concerning the source of the several prizes awarded in connection with this year's judging contest.

The Challenge Cup of course was donated by the Mid-West Poultry and Egg Shippers when the contest idea was started in 1930. Mr. F. P. Price was the man who secured the money for purchasing this trophy.

The permanent trophy awarded to this year's winning team was donated by Purina Mills of St. Louis, Missouri.

The \$35 cup awarded to the best team in exhibition judging was donated by the Keyes-Davis Company of Battle Creek, Michigan.

The \$35 cup awarded to the best team in production judging was donated by the "OK" Poultry Journal of Nowata, Oklahoma. The gold medals awarded to the members of the winning all-around team were donated by the Collier Products Company of Clinton, Iowa. They represent a cost of \$50.

The gold, silver and bronze medals for the three high individuals in exhibition judging were donated by the G. E. Conkey Company of Cleveland, Ohio. They represent a value of \$38.

The gold, silver and bronze medals awarded to the three high individuals in the written examination were made possible through donations from the McKilligan Company of Fort Wayne, Indiana, and the National Chick Advertising Service, Inc., 4750 Sheridan Road, Chicago.

The cash awarded to the ten high individuals in all-around judging was donated as follows: Queen Inspector Company, Lincoln, Nebraska, \$50; James Manufacturing Company, Fort Atkinson, Wisconsin, \$50; Coliseum Show Management, \$25; Buffalo Inspector Company, Buffalo, New York, \$10.

It will be a fine thing if each coach will write to the several donors expressing appreciation for the support which they have given to the contest. Will you also urge any of your boys who were winners of prizes at the contest to write to the donors concerned expressing their appreciation.

12/31/28

In this connection we should not forget, as coaches, to write to Mr. L. J. Demberger, Stewartville, Indiana, who was responsible for the selection and placing of the exhibition classes; also to Mr. Hewes and to Mr. Pape of the Coliseum Show Management. Mr. Hewes may be addressed at 25 West Washington Street, Indianapolis, and Mr. Pape at Fort Wayne, Indiana.

Please also write to Dr. O. B. Kent, Poultry Service Department, Quaker Oats Company, 80 East Jackson Street, Chicago. The Quaker Oats Company thru Dr. Kent was responsible for the banquet arrangements, including the favors, balloons, et cetera and the music. Mr. Termohlen of Iowa State College has requested that each of the coaches write to Mr. E. B. Heaton, United States Egg Society, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, expressing appreciation for the courtesies extended in connection with the market inspection trip arranged under the auspices of the United States Egg Society, The Poultry Research Society of America, and The Chicago Chamber of Commerce. In this connection, please write also to Mr. W. F. Priebe, 110 North Franklin Street, and Mr. L. B. Kilbourne, c/o C. H. Weaver & Company, 43-47 South Water Market, Chicago.

It would be a fine thing also to write to Mr. H. S. Johnson, Vice-President, Armour & Company, Union Stock Yards, who talked to the boys at the noon luncheon, and to Mr. A. T. Kearney, Commercial Research Department, Swift & Company, who gave the principal talk at the banquet.

If there is any other information which you desire in this connection, please let us know and if possible I will gladly supply wit.

Very truly yours,

Professor of Poultry Husbandry.

L. E. Card

BM

Dec. 12/28/28

Team Placings
Ninth Annual Judging Contest
Chicago - December 22, 1926

1 - Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa (R. B. Babb, R. Beagley, R. F. Randolph) C. W. Knox, Coach	3086.6
2 - Kansas State Agr. College, Manhattan, Kansas (R. W. O'Hara, R. S. Stewart, F. J. Raleigh) H. M. Scott, Coach	3068.3
3 - Oklahoma A. & M. College, Stillwater, Oklahoma (E. Smith, A. Castles, G. Boevers) R. Penquite, Coach	3048.3
4 - Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana (J. H. Bruckner, W. W. Ullman, R. V. Hadley) L. H. Schwartz, Coach	2978.2
5 - University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois (H. Schilling, L. V. Slothower, E. B. Battershell) F. W. Barrett, Coach	2939.9
6 - University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri (A. L. Farmer, W. C. Bute, J. R. Wilson) E. W. Henderson, Coach	2936.6
7 - Texas A. & M. College, College Station, Texas (D. T. Mann, J. K. Williams, C. E. Hicks) W. F. Munnerlyn, Coach	2874.9
8 - University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska (C. W. Winkler, R. Hill, R. Corlies) S. J. Marsden, Coach	2764.9
9 - North Dakota Agr. College, Fargo, North Dakota (J. W. Lindgren, J. Reynolds, G. Fuller) O. A. Barton, Coach	2713.2
10 - Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio (R. C. Wetherell, L. B. Melching, C. D. Minner) E. L. Dakan, Coach	2558.2

Individual Placings
(All-round)

1 - R. S. Stewart, Kansas 1108.3	6 - J. R. Wilson, Missouri 1028.3
2 - A. Castles, Oklahoma 1100.0	7 - G. Boevers, Oklahoma 1013.3
3 - R. B. Babb, Iowa 1076.6	8 - R. W. O'Hara, Kansas 1005.0
4 - W. W. Ullman, Purdue 1056.6	9 - C. E. Hicks, Texas 998.3
5 - R. F. Randolph, Iowa 1050.0	10 - L. V. Slothower, Ill. 991.6

Teams

1.	Missouri	1065
2.	Oklahoma	1005
3.	Illinois	935
4.	Purdue	930
5.	Kansas	910
6.	Nebraska	895
7.	Ames	880
8.	Ohio	880
9.	Texas	865
10.	North Dakota	835

Individuals

1.	Castles, Aubrey, Oklahoma	395
2.	Stewart, R. S., Kansas	375
3.	Ullman, W. W., Purdue	370
4.	Fuller, G., North Dakota	370
5.	Eute, W. C., Missouri	365
6.	Farmer, A. L., Missouri	355
7.	Wilson, J. R., Missouri	345
8.	Bruckner, J. H., Purdue	340
9.	Babb, R. B., Ames	335
10.	(Boevers, G., Oklahoma	325
	(Slothower, L. V., Illinois	325

Teams

1.	Ames	1320
2.	Texas	1230
3.	Oklahoma	1200
4.	Kansas	1185
5.	North Dakota	1125
6.	Illinois	1125
7.	Purdue	1125
8.	Missouri	1115
9.	Nebraska	1110
10.	Ohio	1025

Individuale

1.	Babb, R. B., Ames	455
2.	Randolph, R. F., Ames	455
3.	O'Hara, R. W., Kansas	425
4.	Mann, D. T., Texas	425
5.	Boevers, George, Oklahoma	425
6.	Stewart, R. S., Kansas	410
7.	Wilson, J. R., Missouri	410
8.	Hill, Roscoe, Nebraska	410
9.	(Beagley, R., Ames	410
	(Battershell, B. B., Illinois	410
	(Melching, L. B., Ohio	410
	(Hicks, C. E., Texas	410

Teams

1.	Kansas	973.3
2.	Purdue	923.2
3.	Ames	886.6
4.	Illinois	879.9
5.	Oklahoma	843.3
6.	Texas	779.9
7.	Nebraska	759.9
8.	Missouri	756.6
9.	North Dakota	753.2
10.	Ohio	653.2

Individuals

1.	O'Hara, R. W., Kansas	330.0
2.	Stewart, R. S., Kansas	323.3
3.	Raleigh, F. J., Kansas	320.0
4.	Slothower, L. V., Illinois	316.6
5.	Hadley, R. V., Purdue	313.3
6.	{Castles, A., Oklahoma	310.0
	{Schilling, H., Illinois	310.0
8.	Ullman, W. W., Purdue	306.6
9.	Bruckner, J. H., Purdue	303.3
10.	{Beagley, Richard, Ames	300.0
	{Randolph, R. F., Ames	300.0

Team	No.	Name of Individual	Exhibit Score	Placing	Product Score	Placing	Written Exam.	Placing	Total Final Score	Final P (individual)	Final P (team)
NEBRASKA	1	Winkler, Cyril W.	305		335		223.3		863.3		
	2	Hill, Roscoe	270		410	8	260.0		940.0		
	3	Corliss, Ralph	320		365		276.6		961.6		
		Team	895	6	1110	9	759.9	7	2784.9		8
AMES	4	Babb, Roy B.	335	9	455	1	286.6		1076.6	3	
	5	Beasley, Richard	250		410	9	300.0	10	960.0		
	6	Randolph, R. F.	295		455	2	300.0	10	1050.0	5	
		Team	880	7	1320	1	886.6	3	3086.6		1
OKLAHOMA	7	Smith, Earl	285		380		270.0		935.0		
	8	Castles, Aubrey	395	1	395		310.0	6	1100.0	2	
	9	Boevers, George	325	10	425	5	263.3		1013.3	7	
		Team	1005	2	1200	3	843.3	5	3048.3		3
ILLINOIS	10	Schilling, Harry	315		365		310.0	6	990.0		
	11	Slothower, L. V.	325	10	350		316.6	4	991.6	10	
	12	Battershell, B. B.	295		410	9	253.3		958.3		
		Team	935	3	1125	6	879.9	4	2939.9		5
MISSOURI	13	Farmer, A. L.	355	6	365		223.3		943.3		
	14	Bute, W. C.	365	5	340		260.0		965.0		
	15	Wilson, J. R.	345	7	410	7	273.3		1028.3	6	
		Team	1065	1	1115	8	756.6	8	2936.6		6
OHIO	16	Wetherell, R. C.	295		280		223.3		798.3		
	17	Melching, L. B.	295		410	9	206.6		911.6		
	18	Minner, C. D.	290		335		223.3		848.3		
		Team	880	8	1025	10	653.2	10	2558.2		10
NORTH DAKOTA	19	Lindgren, J. W.	200		365		256.6		821.6		
	20	Reynolds, J.	265		380		273.3		918.3		
	21	Fuller, G.	370	4	380		223.3		973.3		
		Team	835	10	1125	5	753.2	9	2713.2		9
PURDUE	22	Bruckner, J. H.	340	8	380		303.3	9	1023.3	7	
	23	Ullman, W. W.	370	3	380		306.6	8	1056.6	4	
	24	Hadley, R. V.	220		365		313.3	5	898.3		
		Team	930	4	1125	7	923.2	2	2978.2		4
TEXAS	25	Mann, D. T.	285		425	4	230.0		940.0		
	26	Williams, J. K.	265		395		276.6		936.6		
	27	Hicks, C. E.	315		410	9	273.3		998.3	9	
		Team	865	9	1230	2	779.9	6	2874.9		7
KANSAS	28	O'Hara, R. W.	250		425	3	330.0	1	1005.0	8	
	29	Stewart, R. S.	375	2	410	6	323.3	2	1108.3	1	
	30	Raleigh, F. J.	285		350		320.0	3	955.0		
		Team	910	5	1185	4	973.3	1	3068.3		2
		TOTALS	9200		11560		8209.1		28969.1		

Correct placing 4-1-3-2 3-2-4-1 2-3-1-4 2-1-4-3 1-3-2-4

Name of W. Wyan. R. I. Red W. Leg. B. P. R. R. I. Red

Team	No.	Individual	Hens	Ckls.	Ckls.	Hens	Pullets		
	1	Winkler, Cyril W.	3-4-2-1 55	2-4-3-1 70	1-3-4-2 50	3-4-2-1 30	1-3-2-4 100	305	
NEBRASKA	2	Hill, Roscoe	3-2-1-4 30	4-2-3-1 70	1-4-3-2 35	2-3-4-1 65	2-3-1-4 70	270	
	3	Corliss, Ralph	3-2-4-1 40	2-4-3-1 70	1-2-3-4 70	1-4-2-3 70	2-3-1-4 70	320	
		Team	125	210	155	165	240	895	6
	4	Babb, Roy B.	3-1-4-2 70	3-2-4-1 100	1-4-2-3 40	2-3-1-4 70	3-2-4-1 55	335	9
AMES	5	Beagley, Richard	3-1-2-4 50	3-2-1-4 85	4-1-3-2 25	2-3-4-1 65	4-2-1-3 25	250	
	6	Randolph, R. F.	3-1-2-4 50	3-1-2-4 70	4-1-2-3 30	2-1-4-3 100	4-3-1-2 45	295	
		Team	170	255	95	235	125	880	7
	7	Smith, Earl	3-1-4-2 70	3-1-4-2 60	4-1-2-3 30	2-3-1-4 70	3-2-4-1 55	285	
OKLAHOMA	8	Castles, Aubrey	1-4-2-3 85	3-4-1-2 70	3-1-2-4 70	2-1-4-3 100	2-3-1-4 70	395	1
	9	Boevers, George	3-1-2-4 50	3-4-2-1 90	4-1-2-3 30	2-1-4-3 100	3-2-4-1 55	325	10
		Team	205	220	130	270	180	1005	2
	10	Schilling, Harry	1-2-3-4 50	3-2-4-1 100	1-4-2-3 40	1-4-3-2 55	3-2-1-4 70	315	
ILLINOIS	11	Slothower, L. V.	2-4-1-3 55	3-1-2-4 70	1-4-3-2 35	2-3-1-4 70	1-2-3-4 95	325	10
	12	Battershell, B. B.	3-2-4-1 40	3-1-2-4 70	4-1-2-3 30	1-3-2-4 55	1-3-2-4 100	295	
		Team	145	240	105	180	265	935	3
	13	Farmer, A. L.	1-3-4-2 70	3-4-2-1 90	1-4-2-3 40	2-1-4-3 100	3-2-4-1 55	355	6
MISSOURI	14	Bute, W. C.	1-4-2-3 85	3-2-1-4 85	1-4-2-3 40	1-2-3-4 85	3-2-1-4 70	365	5
	15	Wilson, J. E.	1-4-3-2 90	1-3-4-2 45	1-2-3-4 70	2-3-1-4 70	3-2-1-4 70	345	7
		Team	245	220	150	255	195	1065	1
	16	Wetherell, R. C.	3-2-1-4 30	4-1-2-3 35	2-3-1-4 100	1-3-4-2 45	1-3-4-2 85	295	
OHIO	17	Melching, L. B.	3-2-4-1 40	3-1-4-2 60	2-1-4-3 70	1-4-2-3 70	4-1-3-2 55	295	
	18	Minner, C. D.	3-2-4-1 40	3-4-1-2 70	2-4-3-1 70	1-4-3-2 55	3-2-4-1 55	290	
		Team	110	165	240	170	195	880	8
	19	Lindgren, J. W.	3-1-2-4 50	4-1-3-2 40	1-2-4-3 55	3-1-4-2 25	2-4-3-1 30	200	
NORTH DAKOTA	20	Reynolds, J.	1-3-4-2 70	3-4-1-2 70	4-1-3-2 25	3-4-2-1 30	3-2-1-4 70	265	
	21	Fuller, G.	3-1-4-2 70	3-4-1-2 70	1-2-3-4 70	1-4-2-3 70	3-1-2-4 90	370	4
		Team	190	180	150	125	190	835	10
	22	Bruckner, J. H.	1-3-4-2 70	3-2-4-1 100	4-1-2-3 30	1-2-3-4 85	3-4-1-2 55	340	8
PURDUE	23	Ullman, W. W.	1-3-4-2 70	3-2-4-1 100	4-1-2-3 30	1-2-4-3 95	3-1-4-2 75	370	3
	24	Hadley, R. V.	3-2-1-4 30	1-4-3-2 25	4-1-2-3 30	2-1-3-4 90	4-3-1-2 45	220	
		Team	170	225	90	270	175	930	4
	25	Mann, D. T.	3-2-4-1 40	3-4-1-2 70	1-3-4-2 50	3-2-1-4 55	3-2-1-4 70	285	
TEXAS	26	Williams, J. K.	4-3-1-2 95	3-4-1-2 70	1-4-3-2 35	3-1-4-2 25	3-4-2-1 40	265	
	27	Hicks, C. E.	1-3-4-2 70	2-4-3-1 70	4-3-2-1 50	1-3-2-4 55	3-2-1-4 70	315	
		Team	205	210	135	135	180	865	9
	28	O'Hara, R. W.	4-1-2-3 95	1-4-2-3 15	4-1-3-2 25	1-3-4-2 45	1-4-3-2 70	250	
KANSAS	29	Stewart, R. S.	1-4-2-3 85	3-4-2-1 90	1-2-3-4 70	2-1-3-4 90	3-4-2-1 40	375	2
	30	Baleigh, F. J.	4-3-2-1 70	4-2-3-1 70	3-1-4-2 55	1-3-4-2 45	4-3-1-2 45	285	
		Team	250	175	150	180	155	910	5
		TOTALS	1815	2100	1400	1985	1900	9200	

10th ANNUAL INTERCOLLEGIATE POULTRY JUDGING CONTEST

Chicago, Illinois - December 7, 1929

Institution

Kansas State College
University of Minnesota
University of Illinois
Iowa State College
North Dakota Agr. College
Purdue University
University of Missouri
Oklahoma A & M College
University of Nebraska
Texas A & M College
Michigan State College

Coach

Professor H. M. Scott
Professor A. C. Smith
Professor H. J. Sloan
Professor C. W. Knox
Professor O. A. Barton
Professor L. H. Schwartz
Professor E. W. Henderson
Professor R. B. Penquite
Professor H. E. Alder
Professor W. F. Munnerlyn
Professor F. N. Barrett

Kansas State College Winning Team

Front row: Robert E. Phillips; Edith Bockenstette, alternate; E. M. Leary
Back row: H. M. Scott, Coach; M. M. Taylor



Tenth Midwest Intercollegiate

Poultry Judging Contest

1929

Packet contains:

1. Instructions to the coaches from Manager, Prof. H. A. Bittenbender, Iowa State College.
2. Minutes of meeting of the coaches December 6, 1929, Hotel New Southern.
3. Minutes of meeting of the coaches December 7, 1929, Auditorium Hotel.
4. List of donors of trophies and cash.
5. Schedule of Marketing Inspection Tour.

Make-up of Contest:

Exhibition Judging - Five four-bird rings

Barred Plymouth Rock Pullets
Rhode Island Red Pullets
Rhode Island Red Cockerels
White Leghorn Cockerels
White Wyandotte Hens

Production Judging - Six four-bird rings

White Wyandotte Yearling Hens
Barred Plymouth Rock Yearling Hens
Rhode Island Red Yearling Hens
White Plymouth Rock Yearling Hens
White Leghorn Yearling Hens
White Leghorn Yearling Hens

Written Examination -

Questions on American Standard of Perfection

Tenth Annual Mid-West Intercollegiate Poultry Judging Contest

Chicago, December 7, 1929

Competing Teams in Order of Final Placing

	Total Score
1 - Kansas State Agricultural College, Manhattan, Kansas (M. M. Taylor, E. M. Leary, R. E. Phillips, Jr.) H. M. Scott, Coach	3073.4
2 - University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota (M. J. Simon, E. A. Johnson, R. W. Wayne) A. C. Smith, Coach	2922.5
3 - University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois (O. F. Gaebe, A. J. Hardgrove, W. H. Kauffman) H. J. Sloan, Coach	2892.5
4 - Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa (D. Pendarvis, H. G. Folken, R. A. Nelson) C. W. Knox, Coach	2871.6
5 - North Dakota Agricultural College, Fargo, North Dakota (Wm. Frey, K. Whitney, W. W. Weiser) O. A. Barton, Coach	2856.7
6 - Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana (E. E. Blair, G. Moore, D. B. Eby) L. H. Schwartz, Coach	2818.3
7 - University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri (E. Miller, A. O. Lewis, R. V. St. Clair) E. W. Henderson, Coach	2796.7
8 - Oklahoma A. & M. College, Stillwater, Oklahoma (B. V. Brady, Wm. Kosanke, R. Heusel) R. B. Penquite, Coach	2744.9
9 - University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska (D. C. Ayers, J. Pipal, F. Sampson) H. E. Alder, Coach	2705.1
10 - Texas A. & M. College, College Station, Texas (L. Ehlers, R. J. McCubbin, S. A. Moore) W. F. Munnerlyn, Coach	2581.7
11 - Michigan State College, East Lansing, Michigan (R. Conolly, H. C. Gleason, J. J. Bird) F. N. Barrett, Coach	2551.7

Ten High Individuals

1. H. G. Folken, Iowa	1065.0	6. M. M. Taylor, Kansas	1004.2
2. E. M. Leary, Kansas	1051.7	7. R. W. Wayne, Minn.	1002.5
3. D. C. Ayers, Nebraska	1034.2	8. R. Conolly, Michigan	996.7
4. W. H. Kauffman, Ill.	1031.7	9. E. A. Johnson, Minn.	993.3
5. R. E. Phillips, Jr., Kan.	1017.5	10. A. J. Hardgrove, Ill.	977.5

Chicago, December 7, 1929

Competing Teams in Order of Final Placing

Total Score

3073.4	1 - Kansas State Agricultural College, Manhattan, Kansas (M. M. Taylor, E. M. Leary, R. E. Phillips, Jr.) H. M. Scott, Coach
2922.5	2 - University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota (M. J. Simon, E. A. Johnson, R. W. Wayne) A. C. Smith, Coach
2892.5	3 - University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois (O. F. Geese, A. J. Hargrove, W. H. Knuffman) H. J. Sloan, Coach
2871.6	4 - Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa (D. Bendavis, H. G. Folken, R. A. Nelson) O. W. Knox, Coach
2856.7	5 - North Dakota Agricultural College, Fargo, North Dakota (Wm. Frey, K. Whitney, W. W. Weiser) O. A. Burton, Coach
2818.3	6 - Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana (E. E. Blair, G. Moore, D. B. Eby) L. H. Schwartz, Coach
2796.7	7 - University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri (E. Miller, A. O. Lewis, R. V. St. Clair) E. W. Henderson, Coach
2744.9	8 - Oklahoma A. & M. College, Stillwater, Oklahoma (B. V. Brady, Wm. Kosanke, R. Hensel) R. E. Pendry, Coach
2702.1	9 - University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska (D. O. Ayers, J. Pipal, T. Sampson) H. E. Alder, Coach
2681.7	10 - Texas A. & M. College, College Station, Texas (L. Ehlers, R. J. McDonald, S. A. Moore) W. F. Munnerlyn, Coach
2551.7	11 - Michigan State College, East Lansing, Michigan (R. Conolly, H. G. Gleason, J. J. Bird) T. W. Barrett, Coach

Ten High Individuals

1004.3	1. H. G. Folken, Iowa	1085.0	6. M. M. Taylor, Kansas
1002.8	2. E. M. Leary, Kansas	1051.7	7. R. W. Wayne, Minn.
998.7	3. D. O. Ayers, Nebraska	1034.2	8. R. Conolly, Michigan
993.3	4. W. H. Knuffman, Ill.	1031.7	9. E. A. Johnson, Minn.
977.5	5. R. E. Phillips, Jr., Kan.	1017.5	10. A. J. Hargrove, Ill.

EXHIBITION JUDGING

Chicago, 1929

	<u>Score</u>
1. University of Illinois	1100
2. University of Minnesota	1085
3. Texas A. & M. College	1050
4. Iowa State College	1035
5. University of Nebraska	1025
6. University of Missouri	1010
7. Purdue University	990
8. North Dakota Agricultural College	980
9. Kansas State Agricultural College	955
10. Michigan State College	935
11. Oklahoma A. & M. College	910

- - -

High Individuals

1. R. W. Wayne, Minnesota	405
2. S. A. Moore, Texas	390
3. A. J. Hardgrove, Illinois	385
4. M. J. Simon, Minnesota	380
5. D. C. Ayers, Nebraska	370
6. R. J. McCubbin, Texas	370
7. H. G. Folken, Iowa	370
8. O. F. Gaebe, Illinois	365
9. { R. V. St. Clair, Missouri	350
{ W. W. Weiser, North Dakota	350
{ R. Conolly, Michigan	350
{ W. H. Kauffman, Illinois	350

EXHIBITION JUDGING

Chicago, 1929

Score

1100	1. University of Illinois
1085	2. University of Minnesota
1050	3. Texas A. & M. College
1035	4. Iowa State College
1025	5. University of Nebraska
1010	6. University of Missouri
990	7. Purdue University
980	8. North Dakota Agricultural College
955	9. Kansas State Agricultural College
935	10. Michigan State College
910	11. Oklahoma A. & M. College

High Individuals

405	1. R. W. Wayne, Minnesota
390	2. S. A. Moore, Texas
385	3. A. J. Hardgrove, Illinois
380	4. M. J. Simon, Minnesota
370	5. D. O. Ayers, Nebraska
370	6. R. J. McGubbin, Texas
370	7. H. G. Folken, Iowa
365	8. O. T. Gaebel, Illinois
350	9. R. V. St. Clair, Missouri
350	W. W. Welser, North Dakota
350	R. Conolly, Michigan
350	W. H. Kaufman, Illinois

PRODUCTION JUDGING

Chicago, 1929

	<u>Score</u>
1. Kansas State Agricultural College	1185.0
2. North Dakota Agricultural College	1050.0
3. University of Missouri	1050.0
4. Oklahoma A. & M. College	1045.0
5. Purdue University	1035.0
6. University of Minnesota	987.5
7. University of Illinois	972.5
8. Iowa State College	920.0
9. University of Nebraska	880.0
10. Michigan State College	750.0
11. Texas A. & M. College	735.0

- - -

High Individuals

1. Wm. Frey, North Dakota	410.0
2. E. A. Johnson, Minnesota	410.0
3. M. M. Taylor, Kansas	402.5
4. H. G. Folken, Iowa	395.0
5. E. M. Leary, Kansas	395.0
6. W. H. Kauffman, Illinois	395.0
7. Wm. Kosanke, Oklahoma	395.0
8. R. E. Phillips, Jr., Kansas	387.5
9. D. C. Ayers, Nebraska	387.5
10. G. Moore, Purdue	365.0

PRODUCTION JUDGING

Chicago, 1929

Score	
1185.0	1. Kansas State Agricultural College
1050.0	2. North Dakota Agricultural College
1050.0	3. University of Missouri
1045.0	4. Oklahoma A. & M. College
1035.0	5. Purdue University
987.5	6. University of Minnesota
975.5	7. University of Illinois
950.0	8. Iowa State College
880.0	9. University of Nebraska
750.0	10. Michigan State College
735.0	11. Texas A. & M. College

High Individuals

410.0	1. Wm. Frey, North Dakota
410.0	2. E. A. Johnson, Minnesota
402.5	3. M. M. Taylor, Kansas
395.0	4. H. G. Folken, Iowa
395.0	5. E. M. Leary, Kansas
395.0	6. W. H. Kaufman, Illinois
395.0	7. Wm. Kosanke, Oklahoma
387.5	8. R. E. Phillips, Jr., Kansas
387.5	9. D. O. Ayers, Nebraska
385.0	10. G. Moore, Purdue

WRITTEN EXAMINATION

Chicago, 1929

	<u>Score</u>
1. Kansas State Agricultural College	933.4
2. Iowa State College	916.6
3. Michigan State College	866.7
4. University of Minnesota	850.0
5. North Dakota Agricultural College	826.7
6. University of Illinois	820.0
7. University of Nebraska	800.1
8. Texas A. & M. College	796.7
9. Purdue University	793.3
10. Oklahoma A. & M. College	789.9
11. University of Missouri	736.7

- - -

High Individuals

1. E. M. Leary, Kansas	316.7
2. R. A. Nelson, Iowa	313.3
3. { R. E. Phillips, Jr., Kansas	310.0
{ R. W. Wayne, Minnesota	310.0
5. { M. M. Taylor, Kansas	306.7
{ J. J. Bird, Michigan	306.7
7. { D. Pendarvis, Iowa	303.3
{ Wm. Kosanke, Oklahoma	303.3
9. H. G. Folken, Iowa	300.0
10. { K. Whitney, North Dakota	296.7
{ R. Conolly, Michigan	296.7

WRITTEN EXAMINATION

Chicago, 1929

Scores

933.4	1. Kansas State Agricultural College
918.8	2. Iowa State College
888.7	3. Michigan State College
850.0	4. University of Minnesota
838.7	5. North Dakota Agricultural College
820.0	6. University of Illinois
800.1	7. University of Nebraska
798.7	8. Texas A. & M. College
793.3	9. Purdue University
789.9	10. Oklahoma A. & M. College
738.7	11. University of Missouri

High Individuals

318.7	1. E. M. Leary, Kansas
313.3	2. R. A. Nelson, Iowa
310.0	3. R. E. Phillips, Jr., Kansas
310.0	4. R. W. Wayne, Minnesota
308.7	5. M. M. Taylor, Kansas
308.7	6. J. J. Bird, Michigan
303.3	7. D. Bendavis, Iowa
303.3	8. Wm. Kosanke, Oklahoma
300.0	9. H. G. Folken, Iowa
298.7	10. X. Whitney, North Dakota
298.7	11. R. Conolly, Michigan

(1929)

EXHIBITION

	Correct placing	(10) 3-1-4-2	(5) 2-1-4-3	1-3-4-2	(10) 3-4-2-1	(10) 3-2-4-1	Score	Placings
Team	Name of Individual	B.F.R. Pullets	R.I.Red Pullets	R.I.Red Ckls.	Leg. Ckls.	Wyan. Hens		
KANSAS	M.M.Taylor	4-1-3-2 60	2-3-4-1 55	3-2-1-4 55	1-3-2-4 40	3-2-1-4 85	295	
	E.M.Leary	1-4-3-2 70	2-1-3-4 85	3-2-1-4 55	1-4-3-2 45	3-2-1-4 85	340	
	R.E.Phillips, Jr.	4-1-2-3 40	2-1-4-3 100	1-4-2-3 70	3-1-4-2 70	2-1-4-3 40	320	
	Team	170	240	180	155	210	955	9
MISSOURI	E.Miller	1-4-3-2 70	4-2-3-1 55	1-4-3-2 85	4-2-3-1 70	4-2-1-3 45	325	
	A.O.Lewis	1-3-4-2 90	2-3-4-1 55	3-2-1-4 55	4-3-2-1 90	4-2-1-3 45	335	
	R.V.St.Clair	3-4-1-2 85	2-4-3-1 70	3-4-1-2 70	3-4-1-2 85	4-1-3-2 40	350	9
	Team	245	180	210	245	130	1010	6
NORTH DAKOTA	Wm.Frey	1-4-3-2 70	1-2-4-3 95	3-2-1-4 55	2-1-4-3 30	4-2-1-3 45	295	
	K.Whitney	1-4-3-2 70	1-2-3-4 80	3-4-2-1 55	4-2-3-1 70	3-1-4-2 60	335	
	W.W.Weiser	3-4-1-2 85	2-1-4-3 100	3-4-1-2 70	4-1-3-2 55	2-1-4-3 40	350	9
	Team	225	275	180	155	145	980	8
AMES	D.Pendarvis	3-4-1-2 85	2-4-3-1 70	1-4-3-2 85	2-4-1-3 40	2-4-1-3 55	335	
	H.G.Folken	3-4-1-2 85	2-4-3-1 70	3-1-4-2 85	4-3-1-2 75	2-4-1-3 55	370	7
	H.A.Nelson	1-3-4-2 90	4-2-3-1 55	3-1-4-2 85	4-2-1-3 55	4-2-1-3 45	330	
	Team	260	195	255	170	155	1035	4
MICHIGAN	R.Conolly	1-4-2-3 55	2-1-4-3 100	4-1-3-2 70	4-2-1-3 55	3-1-2-4 70	350	9
	H.C.Gleason	4-1-3-2 60	4-3-2-1 40	3-4-1-2 70	3-4-1-2 85	2-1-4-3 40	295	
	J.J.Bird	1-4-3-2 70	2-3-4-1 55	4-3-1-2 55	1-3-4-2 55	2-4-1-3 55	290	
	Team	185	195	195	195	165	935	10
MINNESOTA	M.J.Simon	1-4-2-3 55	2-1-3-4 85	3-1-4-2 85	4-2-3-1 70	2-3-4-1 85	380	4
	E.A.Johnson	3-1-4-2 100	4-1-2-3 65	4-1-2-3 55	1-4-2-3 25	2-4-1-3 55	300	
	R.W.Wayne	1-3-4-2 90	2-1-3-4 85	1-4-3-2 85	3-4-1-2 85	3-1-4-2 60	405	1
	Team	245	235	225	180	200	1085	2

EXHIBIT 10

[illegible]

Exhibition, page 2.

Team	Correct placing Name of Individual	(10)	(5)	(10)	(10)	Score	Placings
		3-1-4-2	2-1-4-3	1-3-4-2	3-4-2-1		
		B.P.R. Pullets	R.I. Red Pullets	R.I. Red Ckls.	Leg. Ckls. Wyan. Hens		
PURDUE	E.E. Blair	4-1-3-2 60	4-2-3-1 55	1-3-4-2 100	2-4-1-3 40	4-3-2-1 70	325
	G. Moore	3-4-1-2 85	2-4-1-3 85	4-3-2-1 40	4-2-1-3 55	4-2-3-1 60	325
	D.B. Eby	1-3-4-2 90	4-2-1-3 70	4-3-1-2 55	4-2-1-3 55	3-4-1-2 70	340
	Team	235	210	195	150	200	990
	L. Ehlers	1-4-3-2 70	2-1-4-3 100	3-1-4-2 85	4-1-3-2 55	4-2-3-1 60	370
TEXAS	E.J. McCubbin	1-4-3-2 70	2-4-3-1 70	3-1-2-4 70	4-2-1-3 55	4-1-2-3 25	290
	S.A. Moore	3-1-4-2 100	2-1-4-3 100	3-1-4-2 85	2-4-3-1 60	4-2-1-3 45	390
	Team	240	270	240	170	130	1050
	B.V. Brady	1-4-3-2 70	2-4-1-3 85	3-1-2-4 70	4-2-3-1 70	2-1-4-3 40	335
OKLAHOMA	Wm. Kosanke	1-4-3-2 70	4-1-2-3 65	4-1-3-2 70	4-1-2-3 40	4-1-2-3 25	270
	E. Hensel	1-4-3-2 70	2-4-3-1 70	3-2-1-4 55	2-3-4-1 70	2-1-4-3 40	305
	Team	210	220	195	180	105	910
	D.C. Avers	3-1-4-2 100	2-4-3-1 70	1-4-3-2 85	2-4-3-1 60	1-3-2-4 55	370
	J. Pipal	1-4-3-2 70	4-2-1-3 70	4-1-2-3 55	1-4-3-2 45	3-2-1-4 85	325
NEBRASKA	F. Sampson	1-4-3-2 70	2-1-4-3 100	1-4-3-2 85	1-2-4-3 5	2-3-1-4 70	330
	Team	240	240	225	110	210	1025
	O.F. Gaebe	3-1-4-2 100	1-2-4-3 95	4-3-1-2 55	1-4-3-2 45	2-3-1-4 70	365
	A.J. Hardgrove	1-3-2-4 75	1-2-3-4 80	3-1-4-2 85	4-1-3-2 55	3-4-2-1 90	385
ILLINOIS	W.H. Kauffman	1-3-4-2 90	2-3-1-4 70	3-4-1-2 70	4-3-1-2 75	4-2-1-3 45	350
	Team	265	245	210	175	205	1100
	TOTALS	2520	2505	2310	1885	1855	11075

PRODUCTION

Team	Correct placing Name of Individual	2-4-1-3 Wyan.	3-2-1-4 B.P. Rocks	1-3-4 W. P. Rocks*	3-2-4-1 B. I. Reds	3-2-1-4 Leg- horns	1-3-4-2 Leg- horns	Score**	Plac- ings
KANSAS		2-4-1-3	3-1-2-4	3-1-4-2	3-2-1-4	3-4-1-2	4-1-3-2		
	M.M. Taylor	100	85	70	85	55	70	402.5	3
		2-1-3-4	3-2-1-4	3-1-4-2	3-2-4-1	2-3-4-1	3-2-4-1		
	E.M. Leary	70	100	70	100	70	40	395.0	5
		2-1-4-3	3-2-1-4	2-3-1-4	3-1-2-4	3-4-2-1	2-1-3-4		
MISSOURI	E.E. Phillips, Jr.	85	100	70	70	70	55	387.5	8
	Team	255	285	210	255	195	165	1185.0	1
		4-3-2-1	2-3-1-4	3-2-1-4	3-1-2-4	3-1-2-4	2-1-4-3		
	E. Miller	55	85	70	70	85	40	342.5	
		2-1-4-3	3-1-2-4	3-4-1-2	3-2-4-1	2-1-4-3	3-2-4-1		
NORTH DAKOTA	A.O. Lewis	85	85	40	100	55	40	357.5	
		1-2-4-3	3-2-1-4	2-1-4-3	4-2-3-1	3-2-1-4	2-3-4-1		
	E.V. St. Clair	70	100	70	55	85	25	350.0	
	Team	210	270	180	225	225	105	1050.0	3
		4-2-3-1	3-1-2-4	1-3-4-2	3-2-4-1	2-4-3-1	3-2-1-4		
AMERS	Wm. Frey	70	85	100	100	55	55	410.0	1
		2-1-3-4	2-3-4-1	3-4-1-2	4-3-2-1	3-2-4-1	4-3-2-1		
	K. Whitney	70	70	40	70	85	40	312.5	
		2-1-4-3	2-1-3-4	3-4-1-2	3-1-2-4	4-3-2-1	3-1-2-4		
	W.W. Weiser	85	70	40	70	55	70	327.5	
MICHIGAN	Team	225	225	180	240	195	165	1050.0	2
		2-1-3-4	3-1-4-2	2-4-3-1	1-2-4-3	3-1-4-2	3-1-2-4		
	D. Pendarvis	70	70	0	25	70	70	235.0	
		2-1-3-4	3-4-1-2	1-3-4-2	3-2-4-1	3-4-1-2	1-3-2-4		
	H.G. Folken	70	55	100	100	55	85	395.0	4
MINNESOTA		1-2-4-3	2-3-1-4	3-4-1-2	1-2-3-4	4-2-3-1	3-1-2-4		
	R.A. Nelson	70	85	40	40	40	70	290.0	
	Team	210	210	140	165	165	225	920.0	8
		2-4-3-1	2-3-1-4	1-4-3-2	2-4-1-3	3-1-2-4	2-4-1-3		
	R. Conolly	85	85	70	55	85	25	350.0	
MICHIGAN		3-1-2-4	3-2-4-1	3-4-1-2	4-1-2-3	4-1-3-2	3-2-1-4		
	H.C. Gleason	25	85	40	25	25	55	215.0	
		2-1-3-4	3-4-1-2	4-3-1-2	2-1-4-3	4-1-2-3	2-1-4-3		
	J.J. Bird	70	55	0	40	0	40	185.0	
	Team	180	225	110	120	110	120	750.0	10
MINNESOTA		2-1-3-4	3-4-2-1	3-2-4-1	4-3-2-1	4-3-2-1	2-3-4-1		
	M.J. Simon	70	70	40	70	55	25	290.0	
		2-1-4-3	3-2-4-1	1-3-2-4	2-3-1-4	3-4-2-1	1-2-3-4		
	E.A. Johnson	85	85	100	70	70	70	410.0	2
		2-1-4-3	3-2-1-4	4-3-1-2	3-1-2-4	4-2-1-3	3-2-4-1		
MINNESOTA	R.W. Wayne	85	100	0	70	25	40	287.5	
	Team	240	255	140	210	150	135	987.5	6

*No. 2 bird disqualified and not considered in grading.

**The Leghorn score is the average of scores made on the two Leghorn classes.

PRODUCTION

State	Team	Individual	Score	Place
MINNESOTA	E. W. Weaver	3-1-1-1	85	1
	E. A. Johnson	3-1-1-1	85	2
	E. L. Stine	3-1-1-1	85	3
	Team	3-1-1-1	255	4
MICHIGAN	L. E. Rink	3-1-1-1	85	1
	W. C. Gleason	3-1-1-1	85	2
	R. Conolly	3-1-1-1	85	3
	Team	3-1-1-1	255	4
ARIZONA	E. A. Nelson	3-1-1-1	85	1
	H. S. Polk	3-1-1-1	85	2
	E. Bendavis	3-1-1-1	85	3
	Team	3-1-1-1	255	4
NORTH DAKOTA	E. W. Weaver	3-1-1-1	85	1
	E. W. Weaver	3-1-1-1	85	2
	E. W. Weaver	3-1-1-1	85	3
	Team	3-1-1-1	255	4
MISSOURI	E. W. Weaver	3-1-1-1	85	1
	A. O. Lewis	3-1-1-1	85	2
	R. Miller	3-1-1-1	85	3
	Team	3-1-1-1	255	4
KANSAS	E. W. Weaver	3-1-1-1	85	1
	E. W. Weaver	3-1-1-1	85	2
	E. W. Weaver	3-1-1-1	85	3
	Team	3-1-1-1	255	4
TEXAS	E. W. Weaver	3-1-1-1	85	1
	E. W. Weaver	3-1-1-1	85	2
	E. W. Weaver	3-1-1-1	85	3
	Team	3-1-1-1	255	4

*No. 2 bird disqualified and not considered in grading.

**The Lehigh score is the average of scores made on the two Lehigh classes.

Team	Correct placing Name of Individual	2-4-1-3 Wyan.	3-2-1-4 B. P. Rocks	1-3-4 W. P. Rocks*	3-2-4-1 R. I. Reds	3-2-1-4 Leg- horns	1-3-4-2 Leg- horns	Score**	Plac- ings
PURDUE		3-4-1-2	3-1-4-2	3-1-4-2	3-4-1-2	3-1-4-2	1-3-2-4		
	E. E. Blair	25	70	70	70	70	85	312.5	
	G. Moore	3-4-2-1	3-2-1-4	3-1-4-2	3-1-2-4	3-2-4-1	1-3-2-4		
		40	100	70	70	85	85	365.0	10
	D. B. Eby	4-2-1-3	3-4-1-2	1-3-4-2	1-3-4-2	3-4-1-2	1-3-4-2		
	Team	85	55	100	40	55	100	357.5	
		150	225	240	180	210	270	1035.0	5
TEXAS		2-1-3-4	3-2-4-1	2-4-3-1	4-1-3-2	4-1-3-2	3-4-1-2		
	L. Ehlers	70	85	0	40	25	70	242.5	
	B. J. McCubbin	3-4-2-1	3-2-1-4	3-4-2-1	4-3-2-1	3-4-2-1	1-3-2-4		
		40	100	40	70	70	85	327.5	
	S. A. Moore	3-4-1-2	4-1-2-3	2-4-3-1	3-1-2-4	3-4-2-1	3-1-2-4		
	Team	25	0	0	70	70	70	165.0	
		135	185	40	180	165	225	735.0	11
OKLAHOMA		2-1-3-4	3-2-1-4	4-3-2-1	3-4-2-1	3-4-2-1	1-2-3-4		
	B. V. Brady	70	100	0	85	70	70	325.0	
	Wm. Kosanke	2-4-3-1	1-3-2-4	1-3-4-2	3-2-1-4	3-4-1-2	4-1-2-3		
		85	70	100	85	55	55	395.0	7
	R. Heusel	2-1-4-3	3-2-1-4	4-2-3-1	3-1-2-4	3-4-1-2	3-1-4-2		
	Team	85	100	0	70	55	85	325.0	
		240	270	100	240	180	210	1045.0	4
NEBRASKA		1-2-3-4	3-2-4-1	1-3-4-2	2-3-4-1	3-4-1-2	1-4-2-3		
	D. C. Ayers	55	85	100	85	55	70	387.5	9
	J. Pipal	1-3-4-2	3-2-4-1	2-1-4-3	2-4-1-3	3-1-2-4	1-2-3-4		
		25	85	70	55	85	70	312.5	
	F. Sampson	3-1-4-2	2-3-1-4	2-4-3-1	4-1-2-3	3-1-4-2	3-1-2-4		
	Team	0	85	0	25	70	70	180.0	
		80	255	170	165	210	210	880.0	9
ILLINOIS		1-2-3-4	3-2-4-1	4-3-2-1	4-3-2-1	3-4-2-1	2-3-1-4		
	O. F. Gaebe	55	85	0	70	70	40	265.0	
	A. J. Hardgrove	2-1-3-4	3-1-2-4	2-3-4-1	3-1-4-2	2-3-1-4	2-3-1-4		
		70	85	40	55	85	40	312.5	
	W. H. Kauffman	2-1-4-3	3-2-1-4	2-1-4-3	3-4-2-1	3-4-1-2	3-2-1-4		
	Team	85	100	70	85	55	55	395.0	6
		210	270	110	210	210	135	972.5	7
	TOTALS	2135	2675	1620	2190	2015	1965	10610.	

1990

*No. 2 bird disqualified and not considered in grading.

**The Leghorn score is the average of scores made on the two Leghorn classes.

Team	Individual	Name of Player	Points	Reb.	Ass.	St.	Bl.	Tr.	F.	Min.	P.P.G.	R.P.G.	A.P.G.	S.P.G.	B.P.G.	T.P.G.	F.P.G.	Min.
TOTALS	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
ILLINOIS	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010	10010
	2172	505	1050	5130	5012	100												

The Lepore score is the average of scores made on the two Lepore classes.

SUMMARY

Team	Name of Individual	Exhibition Score	Placing	Production Score	Placing	Written Exam.	Placing	Total Final Score	Final Place (individual)	Final Place (team)
KANSAS	M.M. Taylor	295		402.5	3	306.7	5	1004.2	6	
	E.M. Leary	340		395.0	5	316.7	1	1051.7	2	
	R.E. Phillips, Jr.	320		387.5	8	310.0	3	1017.5	5	
	Team	955	9	1185.0	1	933.4	1	3073.4		1
MISSOURI	E. Miller	325		342.5		243.3		910.8		
	A.O. Lewis	335		357.5		236.7		929.2		
	R.V. St. Clair	350	9	350.0		256.7		956.7		
	Team	1010	6	1050.0	3	736.7	11	2796.7		7
NORTH DAKOTA	Wm. Frey	295		410.0	1	240.0		945.0		
	K. Whitney	335		312.5		296.7	10	944.2		
	W.W. Weiser	350	9	327.5		290.0		967.5		
	Team	980	8	1050.0	2	826.7	5	2856.7		5
AMES	D. Pendarvis	335		235.0		303.3	7	873.3		
	H.G. Folken	370	7	395.0	4	300.0	9	1065.0	1	
	R.A. Nelson	330		290.0		313.3	2	933.3		
	Team	1035	4	920.0	8	916.6	2	2871.6		4
MICHIGAN	R. Conolly	350	9	350.0		296.7	10	996.7	8	
	H.C. Gleason	295		215.0		263.3		773.3		
	J.J. Bird	290		185.0		306.7	5	781.7		
	Team	935	10	750.0	10	866.7	3	2551.7		11
MINNESOTA	M.J. Simon	380	4	290.0		256.7		926.7		
	E.A. Johnson	300		410.0	2	283.3		993.3	9	
	R.W. Wayne	405	1	287.5		310.0	3	1002.5	7	
	Team	1085	2	987.5	6	850.0	4	2922.5		2

[illegible]

Team	Name of Individual	Exhibition Score	Placing	Production Score	Placing	Written Exam.	Placing	Total Final Score	Final Place (individual)	Final Place (team)
PURDUE	E.E. Blair	325		312.5		260.0		897.5		
	G. Moore	325		365.0	10	283.3		973.3		
	D.B. Eby	340		357.5		250.0		947.5		
	Team	990	7	1035.0	5	793.3	9	2818.3		6
TEXAS	L. Ehlers	370	6	242.5		263.3		875.8		
	R.J. McCubbin	290		327.5		266.7		884.2		
	S.A. Moore	390	2	165.0		266.7		821.7		
	Team	1050	3	735.0	11	796.7	8	2581.7		10
OKLAHOMA	B.V. Brady	335		325.0		273.3		933.3		
	Wm. Koganke	270		395.0	7	303.3	7	968.3		
	R. Heusel	305		325.0		213.3		843.3		
	Team	910	11	1045.0	4	789.9	10	2744.9		8
NEBRASKA	D.C. Ayers	370	5	387.5	9	276.7		1034.2	3	
	J. Pinal	325		312.5		256.7		894.2		
	F. Sampson	330		180.0		266.7		776.7		
	Team	1025	5	880.0	9	800.1	7	2705.1		9
ILLINOIS	O.F. Gasbe	365	8	265.0		253.3		883.3		
	A.J. Hardgrove	385	3	312.5		280.0		977.5	10	
	W.H. Kauffman	350	9	395.0	6	286.7		1031.7	4	
	Team	1100	1	972.5	7	820.0	6	2892.5		3
	TOTALS	11075		10610.		9130.1		30815.1		

11th ANNUAL INTERCOLLEGIATE POULTRY JUDGING CONTEST

Chicago, Illinois - December 6, 1930

Institution

Iowa State College
Kansas State College
Pennsylvania State College
University of Missouri
Oklahoma A & M College
University of Nebraska
North Dakota Agr. College
Michigan State College
University of Illinois
Ohio State University

Coach

Professor C. W. Knox
Professor H. M. Scott
Professor E. W. Callenbach
Professor E. M. Funk
Professor E. E. Schnetzler
Professor H. E. Alder
Professor G. P. Goodearl
Professor F. N. Barrett
Professor H. J. Sloan
Professor E. L. Dakan

Iowa State College Winning Team

C. W. Knox, Coach; J. Kern; K. Boeke; H. Coolidge; W. Lamoreux; C. Larson



Eleventh Midwest Intercollegiate

Poultry Judging Contest

1930

Packet contains:

1. Instructions concerning the selection of production classes from Professor H. A. Bittenbender, Iowa State College, Manager of contest.
2. Minutes of coaches meeting, December 5, 1930.
3. Minutes of coaches meeting, December 6, 1930.
4. List of donors of trophies and cash prizes.

Make-up of contest:

Exhibition Judging - Five four-bird rings

Rhode Island Red Cockerels
Rhode Island Red Pullets
White Wyandotte Pullets
Barred Plymouth Rock Pullets
White Leghorn Cockerels

Production Judging - Five four-bird rings

White Wyandotte Yearling Hens
Barred Plymouth Rock Yearling Hens
White Plymouth Rock Yearling Hens
Rhode Island Red Yearling Hens
White Leghorn Yearling Hens

Written Examination -

Questions on American Standard of Perfection

No vember 18, 1930

CONCERNING THE SELECTION OF PRODUCTION CLASSES FOR THE MID-WEST
INTERCOLLEGIATE POULTRY JUDGING CONTEST, CHICAGO

1. The production class should be placeable and, as far as possible, do not permit any so called "jokers" to be sent. The class should not be too easy, neither should it be unplaceable. If it is at all possible, the members of the team should not know the birds that you are sending to the Contest.
2. Some member of the staff other than the coach should make the selection of the class.
3. All of the birds in the class should be within three weeks of the same date of hatch and handled under as nearly the same conditions as possible.
4. It is advisable to have at least 15 eggs difference in total production and not more than 25 between each pair.
5. If the class can be selected so that the birds are of uniform production, I believe that it will be better; that is, if the top bird of the class is out of production, it will be better for the other three birds likewise not to be in production or if the top bird is in laying condition, if possible, have all of the birds in laying condition or near laying condition.
6. The idea of sending out these suggestions in regard to selection is, if possible, to obtain 5 production classes that are as nearly uniform as possible in their selection. The main idea is to have fair classes that can be placed so as to make satisfactory competition.
7. The birds must be yearling birds and must have completed their first year of egg production.

Shipping Instructions

1. The Contest classes must be sent express prepaid as the Contest does not have funds for paying for the express.
2. The coops must be marked with return addresses.
3. The birds should be addressed to -

Mid-West Intercollegiate Poultry Judging Contest.
Coliseum Building,
Chicago, Ill.

c/o Coliseum Poultry Show

4. Ship as to reach Chicago Friday morning, December 5th, without fail as the birds must be cooped Friday afternoon. If there is any question, start the birds so as to reach Chicago Thursday afternoon as the birds will be placed in exhibition coops and fed and watered on their arrival.
5. The birds will be returned to you express collect.
6. Leg band numbers of the birds sent should be marked somewhere on the

coop so that the birds can be checked in uncooping and recooping.

Egg Records

1. Egg records should be mailed to H. A. Bittenbender, Manager of Contest, New Southern Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, and marked on the outside of the envelope "Egg Records for Judging Contest". These egg records will be turned over to the Committee on Awards after the Contest starts.
2. The egg records should include date of hatch, date of first egg, monthly production, and total year's production. If second year's production has started, give number of eggs to December 1st, or in other words, it is necessary to have the total number of eggs laid from date of first egg to December 1st, 1929.
3. I should like to have any close pairs marked as "close" or "very close". Average placing will receive a 15 point cut for a switch, close pairs, a 10 point and very close, 5 point. We should much prefer to have the classes selected so that we can use the regular 15 point cut for switch of pairs. In some instances, this may not be possible so should appreciate the notations on the egg records of the closeness of pairs.

HAB/NS

H. A. Bittenbender,
516 Grand Ave.,
Ames, Iowa

Minutes of a Meeting of the Coaches of Teams Competing in
the Mid-West Inter-collegiate Poultry Judging
Contest, December 5, 1930

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, H. A. Bittenbender,
at 4:15 p. m.

The following coaches were present; E. M. Funk, Missouri; C. W. Knox
Iowa; George P. Goodearl, North Dakota; H. J. Sloan, Illinois; H. E.
Alder, Nebraska; F. N. Barrett, Michigan; H. M. Scott, Kansas; E. L.
Dakan, Ohio; E. E. Schnetzler, Oklahoma; E. W. Callenbach, Penn State.

E. W. Callenbach was appointed secretary for the meeting. The
minutes of the coaches meeting for December 6 and 7, 1929 were read and
approved as read.

The matter of the written examination was brought up for discussion.
It was moved by Knox, seconded by Alder that the 1930 Standard of
Perfection, with corrections as listed in E. C. Branch's letter to H. A.
Bittenbender, be the basis of the written examination. Motion was passed.
Considerable discussion seemed to indicate that the interpretation of
questions in the written examination should be based upon the exact
wording of descriptions found in the Standard. Any deviation from the
exact wording would therefore constitute a condition other than normal.

It was moved by Knox, seconded by Barrett, that the chairman appoint
the members of all standing committees, the chairmen of these committees
having already been appointed last year. Motion was passed. The
chairman appointed the following committees:

Examination committee - Scott; Funk; Schnetzler; Dakan; Steup, Chair-
man.

Grading committee - Card; Barrett; Callenbach; Knox, Chairman.

Grade Totaling committee - Steup, Card, Bittenbender.

L. E. Card gave a report of the prize committee and suggested that it might be desirable in the future for senior alternates to compete for a consolation prize in the written examination. This matter was laid on the table until the next meeting of the coaches. It was reported that the association still owes the original \$35.00 and an additional sum of \$1.60 for protest fees for a cup awarded last year by Mr. Dalton. After considerable discussion it was moved by Dakan, seconded by Funk, that after Card talks over the matter with the jeweler and Dalton, he circularize the schools entered in the contest in 1929 for funds necessary to help reduce the donation of Dalton for the cup in question. Ohio is to be included in the list of schools circularized. Motion was passed.

The following monitor committee was appointed by the chairman; Goodearl; Alder; Termohlen; Henderson; Sloan, Chairman.

It was decided that the grading committee and the examination committee and the grade totaling committee should work in the hotel, the monitors to deliver cards to the grading committee. It was further decided that the contestants in the contest be divided into three groups, group 1 meeting at the Coliseum at 7:50 a. m. on Saturday, December 6, groups 2 and 3 meeting in the hotel parlor at 8:00 a. m., the alternates to meet in the parlor at 10:00 a. m. Lots were drawn by the coaches of the various teams, and it was decided that groups numbering 1 to 5 inclusive would start judging exhibition birds with 6 to 10 inclusive to start on the production judging. The following is the way the teams lined up:

Group Number

Institution

- | | |
|-----|------------------|
| 1. | Missouri |
| 2. | Iowa State |
| 3. | Oklahoma A. & M. |
| 4. | Ohio State |
| 5. | Illinois |
| 6. | North Dakota |
| 7. | Kansas |
| 8. | Michigan State |
| 9. | Penn State |
| 10. | Nebraska |

It was announced that the banquet would be held at the Union League Club, 65 West Jackson Blvd., at 6:15 p. m., December 6, 1930.

It was moved by Barrett, seconded by Dakan, that 15 minutes be allowed for judging the first ~~class~~ for each group of contestants, twelve minutes being allowed for each class thereafter, two minutes warning to be given for each class. Motion was passed.

The production classes were furnished as follows: Single Comb Rhode Island Reds, Illinois; Single Comb White Leghorns, Michigan State; Barred Plymouth Rocks, Oklahoma A. & M.; White Wyandottes, Ohio State; White Plymouth Rocks, Iowa State.

It was moved by Alder, seconded by Funk that the total number of eggs from the first egg to December 1 or if this total is not available, ~~that~~ ^{be used} the 365 day egg record for egg production ^{in the} production classes. Motion was passed with Scott and Goodearl voting "No".

The secretary was instructed to send a copy of these minutes to each of the members present. Meeting adjourned at 6:15 p. m. with the understanding that another meeting of the coaches would be held immediately following the close of the banquet on December 6, 1930.

Signed:

E. W. Callenbach, Secretary

Minutes of a Meeting of the Coaches of Teams Competing in
the Mid-West Inter-collegiate Poultry Judging
Contest, December 6, 1930

The meeting was called to order by H. A. Bittenbender, Chairman,
at 9:45 p. m.

The matter of conducting a contest in 1931 was brought up for
discussion. It was moved by Dakan and seconded by Card that a contest
be held next year in connection with the Coliseum Show which will be
held December 2 - 6, 1931. The contest ~~s~~^would be held on December 5.
Motion was passed. It was moved by Dakan, seconded by Barrett, that
H. A. Bittenbender be re-elected by acclamation as chairman of next
year's contest. Motion was passed.

It was moved by Dakan, seconded by Scott, that the chairman appoint
his own executive committee to act during the coming year, this committee
to consist of the general chairman, and the chairmen of the award~~ing~~^s,
examination, and grading committees. The following are the chairmen of
each of the above committees:

The chairman discussed the desirability of drawing up a definite set
of rules and regulations to govern the conduct~~ion~~ of the Mid-West Inter-
collegiate Poultry Judging Contest. He suggested that the executive
committee attend to the matter. It was moved by Funk, seconded by Barrett that
th~~e~~ chairman proceed as above with the understanding that some individual
be assigned to draw up the rules and regulations, these then to be sub-
mitted to the various institutions for approval.

The following party was appointed to do this work:

It was suggested that the coaches of the teams ^{participating} ~~reporting~~ in the 1930 contest write letters of appreciation to the parties responsible for the various good things pertaining to the 1930 contest and the inspection trip in connection with it. The following are the names of ~~the~~ individuals and firms who contributed to the success of the contest and the inspection trip.

The question of the desirability of adding meat and egg classes to the judging part of the contest and placing less emphasis on the examination were brought up for discussion. It was moved by Funk, seconded by Card, that the chair place before each department the question of the desirability of including egg and meat classes in the 1931 contest. The vote on the question ^{is} ~~to~~ be by departments, not by individual coaches, all institutions on the mailing list to be polled. Motion was carried with

The following party was appointed to do this work:

It was suggested that the coaches of the teams participating in the

1930 contest write letters of appreciation to the parties responsible

for the various good things pertaining to the 1930 contest and the

inspection trip in connection with it. The following are the names of

the individuals and firms who contributed to the success of the contest

and the inspection trip.

The question of the desirability of adding meat and egg classes to the judging part of the contest and placing less emphasis on the examination were brought up for discussion. It was moved by Funk, seconded by Card, that the chair place before each department the question of the desirability of including egg and meat classes in the 1931 contest. The vote on the question¹ to be by departments, not by individual coaches, all institutions the mailing list to be polled. Motion was carried with

North Dakota and Nebraska voting "No". The following is a record of the reaction of the coaches and other parties present to the above question:

In favor, Dakan, Card, Schnetzler, Barrett, Funk, Shrader, Kent, Halpin, and Henderson; opposed, Sloan, Scott, Alder, Goodearl; not voting,

Knox, and Callenbach. Considerable discussion of the above matter took place with Kent expressing the thought that colleges should consider the

meat value of chickens. He stated that the Coliseum Show management could furnish suitable live or dressed material for judging purposes.

The following is a roll call of those present at this meeting: O. B. Kent,

A. G. Philips, J. G. Halpin, E. W. Henderson, E. M. Funk, L. J. Demberger,

C. W. Knox, H. E. Shrader, Geo. P. Goodearl, H. J. Sloan, H. E. Alder,

F. N. Barrett, L. E. Card, H. M. Scott, E. L. Dakan, E. E. Schnetzler,

W. A. Maw, E. W. Callenbach, H. A. Bittenbender.

The secretary was instructed to send a copy of these minutes to each person present at the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 10:10 p. m.

Signed:

E. W. Callenbach, Secretary

with Dakota and Nebraska voting "No". The following is a record of the action of the coaches and other parties present to the above question: Favor, Dakan, Gars, Schnetzler, Barrett, Frank, Shrader, Kent, Halpin, Henderson; opposed, Sloan, Scott, Alster, Goodenrich; not voting, Kent, and Callenbach. Considerable discussion of the above matter took place with Kent expressing the thought that colleges should consider the value of chickens. He stated that the Coliseum show management did furnish suitable live or dressed material for judging purposes. The following is a roll call of those present at this meeting: G. E. Halpin, G. Phillips, J. G. Halpin, E. W. Henderson, E. M. Frank, L. J. Dembarger, W. Knox, E. E. Shrader, Geo. F. Goodenrich, H. J. Sloan, H. E. Alster, H. Barrett, L. M. Gars, H. M. Scott, E. D. Dakan, E. E. Schnetzler, A. New, E. W. Callenbach, E. A. Bittenbender. The secretary was instructed to send a copy of these minutes to each person present at the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 10:10 p. m.

Signed:

E. W. Callenbach, Secretary

Eleventh Annual Mid-West Intercollegiate Poultry Judging Contest

Chicago, December 6, 1930

Competing Teams in Order of Final Placing

	Total Score
1 - Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa (K. Bocke, J. Kern, W. Lamoreux) C. W. Knox, Coach	3358.3
2 - Kansas State Agr. College, Manhattan, Kansas (J. Bentley, L. A. Wilhelm, F. A. Mueller) H. M. Scott, Coach	3168.4
3 - Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa. (R. R. Parks, L. T. Miller, F. Jeffrey) E. W. Callenbach, Coach	3133.3
4 - University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri (H. Fick, G. A. Woodruff, F. Knight) E. M. Funk, Coach	3073.3
5 - Oklahoma A. and M. College, Stillwater, Okla. (F. Perry, J. Kellerhals, S. Perry) E. E. Schnetzler, Coach	2973.4
6 - University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska (F. W. Belders, B. Lemere, H. C. Traulsen) H. E. Alder, Coach	2946.7
7 - North Dakota Agr. College, Fargo, N. Dakota (F. Forbes, D. Wardwell, M. A. Tuntland) G. P. Goodearl, Coach	2898.3
8 - Michigan State College, E. Lansing, Michigan (W. Cargo, J. Wilson, E. Johnson) F. N. Barrett, Coach	2880.0
9 - University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois (B. A. Hocking, R. C. Hubbard, E. G. Holt) H. J. Sloan, Coach	2798.3
10 - Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio (D. Splaver, R. G. King, H. F. Browning) E. L. Dakan, Coach	2610.0

Ten High Individuals

1. K. Bocke, Iowa	1195.0	6. F. A. Mueller, Kansas	1061.7
2. J. Bentley, Kansas	1111.7	7. G. A. Woodruff, Missouri	1053.3
3. F. Jeffrey, Pennsylvania	1103.3	8. H. Fick, Missouri	1053.3
4. W. Lamoreux, Iowa	1088.3	9. D. Wardwell, N. Dakota	1046.7
5. J. Kern, Iowa	1075.0	10. L. T. Miller, Pennsylvania	1036.7

Chicago, December 8, 1930

Competing Teams in Order of Final Placing

Total Score

3338.3	1 - Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa (K. Boeke, J. Kern, W. Lamoreux) C. W. Knox, Coach
3183.4	2 - Kansas State Agr. College, Manhattan, Kansas (J. Bentley, L. A. Wilhelm, E. A. Mueller) H. M. Scott, Coach
3133.3	3 - Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa. (R. R. Parks, L. T. Miller, F. Jeffrey) E. W. Callenbach, Coach
3073.3	4 - University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri (H. Fick, G. A. Woodruff, F. Knight) E. M. Funk, Coach
2973.4	5 - Oklahoma A. and M. College, Stillwater, Okla. (F. Perry, J. Kellert, S. Perry) E. E. Schmetzer, Coach
2946.7	6 - University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska (F. W. Belbers, B. Berners, H. C. Traulsen) H. E. Alder, Coach
2898.3	7 - North Dakota Agr. College, Fargo, N. Dakota (F. Forbes, D. Wardwell, M. A. Tuntland) G. P. Gooden, Coach
2880.0	8 - Michigan State College, E. Lansing, Michigan (W. Fargo, J. Wilson, E. Johnson) F. M. Barrett, Coach
2798.3	9 - University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois (E. A. Hooking, R. G. Hubbard, E. G. Holt) H. J. Sloan, Coach
2610.0	10 - Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio (D. Splaver, R. G. King, H. F. Browning) E. L. Dakan, Coach

Ten High Individuals

1081.7	1. K. Boeke, Iowa	1188.0	6. F. A. Mueller, Kansas
1053.3	2. J. Bentley, Kansas	1111.7	7. G. A. Woodruff, Missouri
1053.3	3. F. Jeffrey, Pennsylvania	1103.3	8. H. Fick, Missouri
1046.7	4. W. Lamoreux, Iowa	1088.3	9. D. Wardwell, N. Dakota
1036.7	5. J. Kern, Iowa	1075.0	10. L. T. Miller, Pennsylvania

EXHIBITION JUDGING

Chicago, 1930

	<u>Score</u>
1. Iowa State College	1265
2. University of Missouri	1190
3. Oklahoma A. & M. College	1085
4. Kansas State Agricultural College	1075
5. Pennsylvania State College	1075
6. North Dakota Agricultural College	1030
7. University of Illinois	1010
8. University of Nebraska	1005
9. Michigan State College	905
10. Ohio State University	795

- - - - -

High Individuals

1. K. Bocke, Iowa	460
2. W. Lamoreux, Iowa	435
3. S. Perry, Oklahoma	420
4. G. A. Woodruff, Missouri	405
5. F. Knight, Missouri	400
6. F. Jeffrey, Pennsylvania	390
7. J. Bentley, Kansas	385
8. H. Fick, Missouri	385
9. H. A. Traulsen, Nebraska	380
10. B. A. Hocking, Illinois	380

EXHIBITION JUDGING

Chicago, 1930

Score	
1285	1. Iowa State College
1190	2. University of Missouri
1085	3. Oklahoma A. & M. College
1075	4. Kansas State Agricultural College
1075	5. Pennsylvania State College
1030	6. North Dakota Agricultural College
1010	7. University of Illinois
1005	8. University of Nebraska
905	9. Michigan State College
795	10. Ohio State University

High Individuals

480	1. K. Booke, Iowa
435	2. W. Lamoreux, Iowa
420	3. S. Perry, Oklahoma
405	4. G. A. Woodruff, Missouri
400	5. F. Knight, Missouri
390	6. F. Jeffrey, Pennsylvania
385	7. J. Bentley, Kansas
385	8. H. Fick, Missouri
380	9. H. A. Tranter, Nebraska
380	10. B. A. Hocking, Illinois

PRODUCTION JUDGING

Chicago, 1930

	<u>Score</u>
1. Pennsylvania State College	1305
2. Ohio State University	1245
3. Kansas State Agricultural College	1230
4. Michigan State College	1215
5. University of Nebraska	1185
6. Iowa State College	1170
7. North Dakota Agricultural College	1125
8. Oklahoma A. & M. College	1065
9. University of Missouri	1040
10. University of Illinois	1025

- - - - -

High Individuals

1. L. T. Miller, Pennsylvania	455
2. R. G. King, Ohio	440
3. J. Bentley, Kansas	440
4. (R. C. Hubbard, Illinois	440
{ D. Wardwell, North Dakota	440
{ J. Wilson, Michigan	440
{ F. Jeffrey, Pennsylvania	440
8. H. C. Traulsen, Nebraska	425
9. (K. Bocke, Iowa	425
{ D. Splaver, Ohio	425
{ F. A. Mueller, Kansas	425

PRODUCTION JUDGING

Chicago, 1930

Score

1305	1. Pennsylvania State College
1245	2. Ohio State University
1230	3. Kansas State Agricultural College
1215	4. Michigan State College
1185	5. University of Nebraska
1170	6. Iowa State College
1135	7. North Dakota Agricultural College
1085	8. Oklahoma A. & M. College
1040	9. University of Missouri
1025	10. University of Illinois

High Individuals

455	1. L. T. Miller, Pennsylvania
440	2. R. G. King, Ohio
440	3. J. Bentley, Kansas
440	4. R. C. Hubbard, Illinois
440	5. D. Wardwell, North Dakota
440	6. J. Wilson, Michigan
440	7. F. Jeffrey, Pennsylvania
435	8. H. C. Traulsen, Nebraska
435	9. K. Bocke, Iowa
435	10. D. Solaver, Ohio
435	11. F. A. Mueller, Kansas

WRITTEN EXAMINATION

Chicago, 1930

	<u>Score</u>
1. Iowa State College	923.3
2. Kansas State Agricultural College	863.4
3. University of Missouri	843.3
4. Oklahoma A. & M. College	823.4
5. University of Illinois	763.3
6. Michigan State College	760.0
7. University of Nebraska	756.7
8. Pennsylvania State College	753.3
9. North Dakota Agricultural College	743.3
10. Ohio State University	570.0

- - - - -

High Individuals

1. J. Kern, Iowa	310.0
2. K. Bocke, Iowa	310.0
3. { W. Lamoreux, Iowa	303.3
{ W. Cargo, Michigan	303.3
5. { F. Perry, Oklahoma	290.0
{ L. A. Wilhelm, Kansas	290.0
7. { F. Knight, Missouri	286.7
{ J. Bentley, Kansas	286.7
{ F. A. Mueller, Kansas	286.7
10. { G. A. Woodruff, Missouri	283.3
{ R. C. Hubbard, Illinois	283.3
{ F. W. Belders, Nebraska	283.3

WRITTEN EXAMINATION

Chicago, 1930

Score

928.3	1. Iowa State College
883.4	2. Kansas State Agricultural College
843.3	3. University of Missouri
823.4	4. Oklahoma A. & M. College
763.3	5. University of Illinois
760.0	6. Michigan State College
756.7	7. University of Nebraska
753.3	8. Pennsylvania State College
743.3	9. North Dakota Agricultural College
570.0	10. Ohio State University

High Individuals

310.0	1. J. Kern, Iowa
310.0	2. K. Boeke, Iowa
303.3	3. W. Lamoreaux, Iowa
303.3	4. W. Gargo, Michigan
290.0	5. F. Perry, Oklahoma
290.0	6. L. A. Wilhelm, Kansas
288.7	7. F. Knight, Missouri
286.7	8. J. Bentley, Kansas
286.7	9. F. A. Mueller, Kansas
283.3	10. G. A. Woodruff, Missouri
283.3	11. R. C. Hubbard, Illinois
283.3	12. T. W. Belgers, Nebraska

EXHIBITION

C. C. 7

Team	Name of Individual	Ckls. R.I.Red	W.Wyan. Pullets	R.I.Red Pullets	Leg. Ckls.	B.P.R. Pullets	Total Score	Indy. Placing	Team Placing
MISSOURI	Herbert Fick	100	45	55	100	85	385	8	
	G.A. Woodruff	100	70	40	100	95	405	4	
	F. Knight	100	50	55	100	95	400	5	2
	Team	300	165	150	300	275	1190		2
IOWA STATE	K. Boeke	90	95	80	100	95	460	1	
	J. Kern	85	55	40	90	100	370		
	W. Lamoreux	70	100	85	100	80	435	2	
	Team	245	250	205	290	275	1265		1
OKLAHOMA	F. Perry	100	55	80	60	70	365		
	J. Kellerhals	45	70	25	90	70	300		
	S. Perry	100	55	80	85	100	420	3	
	Team	245	180	185	235	240	1085		3
OHIO	D. Splaver	55	50	35	70	85	295		
	R.G. King	5	25	40	85	80	235		
	H. F. Browning	45	25	10	100	85	265		
	Team	105	100	85	255	250	795		10
ILLINOIS	B. A. Hocking	90	50	55	100	85	380	10	
	R. C. Hubbard	45	45	40	90	55	275		
	E. G. Holt	55	70	70	90	70	355		
	Team	190	165	165	280	210	1010		7
NORTH DAKOTA	F. Forbes	90	45	25	85	55	300		
	D. Wardwell	85	50	65	85	85	370		
	M. A. Tuntland	85	70	40	85	80	360		
	Team	260	165	130	255	220	1030		6
KANSAS	J. Bentley	90	15	80	100	100	385	7	
	L. A. Wilhelm	70	15	55	100	100	340		
	F. A. Mueller	70	95	55	60	70	350		
	Team	230	125	190	260	270	1075		4
MICHIGAN	W. Cargo	40	25	55	85	80	285		
	J. Wilson	60	50	55	90	85	340		
	E. Johnson	30	55	40	60	95	280		
	Team	130	130	150	235	260	905		9
PENN. STATE	R. R. Parks	75	55	25	100	85	340		
	L. T. Miller	70	25	95	85	70	345		
	F. Jeffrey	70	100	70	100	50	390	6	
	Team	215	180	190	285	205	1075		5
NEBRASKA	FO W. Belders	100	25	80	85	25	315		
	B. Lemere	75	45	10	100	80	310		
	H. C. Traulsen	100	55	40	90	95	380	9	
	Team	275	125	130	275	200	1005		8

EXHIBITION

(1)

Team	Individual	Name of Individual	Class	W. Ryan	R.I. Red	Leg.	R.P.R.	Total Score	Indy. Placing	Team Placing
MISSOURI	Herbert Thack	100	45	55	100	85	385	8		
	G.A. Woodruff	100	70	40	100	95	405	4		
	T. Knight	100	50	55	100	95	400	5		
	Team	300	165	150	300	275	1190	3		
IOWA STATE	K. Boeke	90	95	80	100	95	460	1		
	J. Kern	85	55	40	90	100	370			
	W. Lamoreux	70	100	85	100	80	435	2		
	Team	245	250	205	290	275	1265	1		
OKLAHOMA	F. Perry	100	55	80	90	70	395			
	J. Kellierbach	45	70	55	90	70	300			
	S. Perry	100	55	80	85	100	420	3		
	Team	245	180	185	275	240	1085			
OHIO	D. Spilaver	55	50	35	70	85	295			
	R.G. King	5	55	40	85	80	235			
	H. T. Brownline	45	55	10	100	85	295			
	Team	105	100	85	255	250	195	10		
ILLINOIS	B. A. Hocking	90	50	55	100	85	380		10	
	R. C. Hubbard	45	45	40	90	55	275			
	E. G. Holt	55	70	70	90	70	355			
	Team	190	165	165	280	270	1070	7		
NORTH DAKOTA	I. Forbes	90	45	55	85	55	300			
	D. Wardwell	85	50	65	85	85	370			
	M. A. Truittland	85	70	40	85	80	360			
	Team	260	165	170	255	250	1070	6		
KANSAS	J. Bentley	90	15	80	100	100	385		7	
	L. A. Wilhelm	70	15	55	100	100	340			
	E. A. Mueller	70	95	55	60	70	350			
	Team	230	125	190	260	270	1075	4		
MICHIGAN	W. Gargo	40	55	55	85	80	285			
	J. Wilson	60	50	55	90	85	340			
	E. Johnson	70	55	40	60	95	280			
	Team	170	170	150	235	260	905	9		
PENN. STATE	R. R. Parks	75	55	55	100	85	370			
	L. T. Miller	70	55	95	85	70	375			
	F. Jeffery	70	100	70	100	50	390		6	
	Team	215	180	190	285	205	1075	5		
NEBRASKA	W. W. Belgers	100	55	80	85	55	375			
	B. Lemere	75	45	10	100	80	310			
	H. C. Truittsen	100	55	40	90	95	380		9	
	Team	275	155	170	275	200	1005	8		

PRODUCTION

Team	Name of Individual	Wyan-dottes	B.P. Rocks	W.P. Rocks	R.I. Reds	Leghorns	Total Score	Indy. Plac.	Team Placing
MISSOURI	Herbert Fick	85	85	70	55	100	395		
	G. A. Woodruff	70	55	100	55	85	365		
	F. Knight	55	70	85	70	0	280		
	Team	210	210	255	180	185	1040		9 *
IOWA STATE	K. Boeke	85	85	100	85	70	425	9	
	J. Kern	55	85	85	100	70	395		
	W. Lamoreux	100	40	85	55	70	350		
	Team	240	210	270	240	210	1170		6
OKLAHOMA	F. Perry	85	70	55	70	40	320		
	J. Kellerhals	55	85	85	70	100	395		
	S. Perry	55	100	70	100	85	350		
	Team	195	195	210	240	225	1065		8
OHIO 66	D. Splaver	100	85	85	70	85	425	9	
	R.G. King	85	100	85	70	100	440	2	
	H.F. Browning	70	100	85	55	70	380		
	Team	255	285	255	195	255	1245		2
ILLINOIS	B.A. Hocking	0	85	70	85	25	265		
	R.C. Hubbard	100	85	85	85	85	440	4	
	E.G. Holt	25	85	85	100	25	320		
	Team	125	255	240	270	135	1025		10
NORTH DAKOTA	F. Forbes	70	40	100	40	100	350		
	D. Wardwell	85	85	85	100	85	440	4	
	M.A. Tuntland	85	40	100	25	85	335		
	Team	240	165	285	165	270	1125		7
KANSAS	J. Bentley	85	85	70	100	100	440	3	
	L.A. Wilhelm	70	70	55	85	85	365		
	F.A. Mueller	85	70	85	85	100	425	9	
	Team	240	225	210	270	285	1230		3
MICHIGAN	W. Cargo	70	70	85	85	70	380		
	J. Wilson	85	100	85	85	85	440	4	
	E. Johnson	100	100	85	55	55	395		
	Team	255	270	255	225	210	1215		4
PENN. STATE	R.R. Parks	100	85	70	70	85	410		
	L.T. Miller	100	100	85	70	100	455	1	
	F. Jeffrey	85	100	85	85	85	440	4	
	Team	285	285	240	225	270	1305		1
NEBRASKA	F.W. Belders	40	85	70	70	85	350		
	B. Lemere	100	70	100	70	70	410		
	H.C. Traulsen	70	100	100	85	70	425	8	
	Team	210	255	270	225	225	1185		5

PRODUCTION

Team	Individual	Wm- Cotton	B.P. Rocks	W.P. Rocks	H.I. Rocks	Normans Rocks	Total Rocks	Indiv. Place	Team Ranking
MISSOURI	Harbert Nick	85	85	70	55	100	395		
	G. A. Woodruff	70	55	100	55	85	365		
	E. Knight	55	70	85	70	0	280		
	Team	210	210	255	180	185	1040	2	
TEXAS	E. Boone	85	85	100	85	70	425		
	J. Kern	55	85	85	100	70	395		
	W. Lawrence	100	40	85	55	70	350		
	Team	240	210	270	240	210	1170	6	
OKLAHOMA	T. Perry	85	70	55	70	40	320		
	J. Kellertala	55	85	85	70	100	395		
	S. Perry	55	40	70	100	85	350		
	Team	195	195	210	240	295	1035	8	
OHIO	D. Splaver	100	85	85	70	85	425		
	R.G. King	85	100	85	70	100	440		
	H.K. Browning	70	100	85	55	70	380		
	Team	255	285	255	195	255	1245	5	
ILLINOIS	B.A. Hocking	0	85	70	85	55	295		
	R.O. Hubbard	100	85	85	85	85	440		
	W.G. Holt	55	85	85	100	55	380		
	Team	155	255	240	270	195	1065	10	
NORTH DAKOTA	W. Forbes	70	40	100	40	100	350		
	D. Wardwell	85	85	85	100	85	440		
	M.A. Tuntland	85	40	100	55	85	365		
	Team	240	165	285	195	270	1155	7	
KANSAS	T. Bentley	85	85	70	100	100	440		
	L.A. Wilhelm	70	70	55	85	85	365		
	E.A. Mueller	85	70	85	85	100	425		
	Team	240	225	210	270	285	1230	3	
MICHIGAN	W. Carso	70	70	85	85	70	380		
	J. Wilson	85	100	85	85	85	440		
	E. Johnson	100	100	85	85	55	395		
	Team	255	270	255	240	210	1230	4	
PENN. STATE	R.R. Farris	100	85	70	70	85	410		
	L.T. Miller	100	100	85	70	100	455		
	E. Goffner	85	100	85	85	85	440		
	Team	285	285	240	255	270	1235	1	
NEBRASKA	W.W. Bolters	40	85	70	70	85	350		
	B. Lemere	100	70	100	70	70	410		
	H.G. Thomsen	70	100	100	85	70	425		
	Team	210	255	270	255	265	1155	2	

SUMMARY

Team	Name of Individual	Exhibition Score	Placing	Production Score	Placing	Written Exam.	Placing	Total Final Score	Final Place (individual)	Final Place (team)
	Herbert Fick	385	8	395		273.3		1053.3	8	
MISSOURI	G. A. Woodruff	405	4	365		283.3	10	1053.3	7	
	F. Knight	400	5	280		286.7	7	966.7		
	Team	1190	2	1040	9	843.3	3	3073.3		4
IOWA STATE	K. Boeke	460	1	425	9	310.0	2	1195.0	1	
	J. Kern	370		395		310.0	1	1075.0	5	
	W. Lamoreux	435	2	350		303.3	3	1088.3	4	
	Team	1265	1	1170	6	923.3	1	3358.3		1
OKLAHOMA	F. Perry	365		320		290.0	5	975.0		
	J. Kellerhals	300		395		266.7		961.7		
	S. Perry	420	3	350		266.7		1036.7		
	Team	1085	3	1065	8	823.4	4	2973.4		5
OHIO	D. Splaver	295		425	9	170.0		890.0		
	R. G. King	235		440	2	233.3		908.3		
	H. F. Browning	265		380		166.7		811.7		
	Team	795	10	1245	2	570.0	10	2610.0		10
ILLINOIS	B. A. Hocking	380	10	265		233.3		878.3		
	R. C. Hubbard	275		440	4	283.3	10	998.3		
	E. G. Holt	355		320		246.7		921.7		
	Team	1010	7	1025	10	763.3	5	2798.3		9
NORTH DAKOTA	F. Forbes	300		350		243.3		893.3		
	D. Wardwell	370		440	4	236.7		1046.7	9	
	M. A. Tuntland	360		335		263.3		958.3		
	Team	1030	6	1125	7	743.3	9	2898.3		7
KANSAS	J. Bentley	385	7	440	3	286.7	7	1111.7	2	
	L. A. Wilhelm	340		365		290.0	5	995.0		
	F. A. Mueller	350		425	9	286.7	7	1061.7	6	
	Team	1075	4	1230	3	863.4	2	3168.4		2
MICHIGAN	W. Cargo	285		380		303.3	3	968.3		
	J. Wilson	340		440	4	220.0		1000.0		
	E. Johnson	280		395		236.7		911.7		
	Team	905	9	1215	4	760.0	6	2880.0		8
PENN. STATE	R. R. Parks	340		410		243.3		993.3		
	L. T. Miller	345		445	1	236.7		1036.7	10	
	F. Jeffrey	390	6	440	4	273.3		1103.3	3	
	Team	1075	5	1305	1	753.3	8	3133.3		3
NEBRASKA	F. W. Belders	315		350		283.3	10	948.3		
	B. Lemere	310		410		256.7		976.7		
	H. C. Traulsen	380	9	425	8	216.7		1021.7		
	Team	1005	8	1185	5	756.7	7	2946.7		6

12th ANNUAL INTERCOLLEGIATE POULTRY JUDGING CONTEST

Chicago, Illinois - December 5, 1931

Institution

Oklahoma A & M College
Iowa State College
Kansas State College
University of Missouri
Pennsylvania State College
North Dakota Agr. College
University of Nebraska
University of Arizona
Ohio State University


Coach

Professor R. B. Penquite
Professor N. F. Waters
Professor H. M. Scott
Professor E. M. Funk
Professor D. R. Marble
Professor C. P. Goodearl
Professor H. E. Alder
Professor H. E. Embleton
Professor E. L. Dakan

Oklahoma A & M College Winning Team

Anthony Floyd, Jr.; Wilbor Wilson; William Irwin

Individual
Perfect Score
Exhibition Judging 500
Production Judging 500
Examination 333.3
Contest 1333.3



Anthony Floyd, Jr.
Tied for Nineteenth in



Wilbor Wilson
Tied for First in Exhibition Judging; Score 410
Fifth in Production Judging; Score 380
Tied for First in Written Examination; Score 296.7
Tied for First in Entire Contest; Score 1086.7

Oklahoma A. & M. College
1931 Team at Midwest
Intercollegiate Poultry

Team
Perfect Score
Exhibition Judging 1500
Production Judging 1500
Written Examination 1000
Contest 4000



William Irwin
Ninth in Exhibition

Twelfth Midwest Intercollegiate

Poultry Judging Contest

1931

Packet contains:

1. Minutes of the meeting of the coaches, December 4, 1931, Professor H. A. Bittenbender, Iowa State College, Manager of Contest.
2. Minutes of the meeting of the coaches, December 5, 1931.
3. List of donors of cups, medals, and cash.

Make-up of Contest:

Exhibition Judging - Five four-bird rings

Rhode Island Red Pullets
Rhode Island Red Cockerels
Barred Plymouth Rock Pullets
White Leghorn Cockerels
White Wyandotte Females

Production Judging - Five four-bird rings

Rhode Island Red Yearling Hens
White Leghorn Yearling Hens
Barred Plymouth Rock Yearling Hens
White Plymouth Rock Yearling Hens
White Wyandotte Yearling Hens

Written Examination -

Questions on American Standard of Perfection

Minutes of a Meeting of the Coaches of Teams Competing in
the Mid-West Intercollegiate Poultry Judging
Contest, December 4, 1931

Meeting was called to order by the chairman, H. A. Bittenbender, at 5 p. m. The following persons were present: E. M. Funk, Missouri; N. F. Waters, Iowa State; George P. Goodearl, North Dakota; H. E. Alder, Nebraska; H. M. Scott, Kansas; E. L. Dakan, Ohio; R. Penquite, Oklahoma; H. Embleton, Arizona; L. E. Card, Illinois; H. H. Steup; H. A. Bittenbender; and D. R. Marble, Penn State.

D. R. Marble was appointed secretary for the meeting to fill the place held by E. W. Callenbach of Penn State.

The minutes of the coaches' meeting for December 5th and 6th, 1930 were read and approved as read.

Drawing for the order of line-up for the contest resulted as follows:

- | | |
|-----------------|-------------|
| 1. Penn State | 6. Nebraska |
| 2. Missouri | 7. Oklahoma |
| 3. Kansas | 8. Iowa |
| 4. Ohio | 9. Arizona |
| 5. North Dakota | |

The production classes for the contest were supplied by the following institutions:

White Leghorn - Kansas

White Leghorn - Penn State

Barred P. Rocks - Michigan

Wyandottes - Iowa

Rhode Island Reds - North Dakota

White Plymouth Rocks - Ohio

Dakan of Ohio explained the White Rock class indicating that in order to make up a suitable class it was necessary to start with the

Minutes of a Meeting of the Coaches of Teams Competing in

the Mid-West Intercollegiate Poultry Judging

Contest, December 4, 1931

Meeting was called to order by the chairman, H. A. Bittenbender,

at 5 p. m. The following persons were present: E. M. Funk, Missouri;

N. T. Waters, Iowa State; George P. Goodenough, North Dakota; H. E. Alder,

Nebraska; H. M. Scott, Kansas; E. L. Deken, Ohio; R. Pendleton, Oklahoma;

H. Embleton, Arizona; L. E. Gard, Illinois; H. H. Steup, H. A. Bitten-

bender; and D. R. Marble, Penn State.

D. R. Marble was appointed secretary for the meeting to fill the

place held by E. W. Galienbach of Penn State.

The minutes of the coaches' meeting for December 5th and 6th, 1930

were read and approved as read.

Drawing for the order of line-up for the contest resulted as

follows:

1. Penn State
2. Missouri
3. Kansas
4. Ohio
5. North Dakota
6. Nebraska
7. Oklahoma
8. Iowa
9. Arizona

The production classes for the contest were supplied by the

following institutions:

- White Leghorn - Kansas
- White Leghorn - Penn State
- Barred P. Rocks - Michigan
- Wyandottes - Iowa
- Rhode Island Reds - North Dakota
- White Plymouth Rocks - Ohio

Deken of Ohio explained the White Rock class indicating that in

order to make up a suitable class it was necessary to start with the

high production bird laying about 200 eggs. He also stated as his opinion that the birds were placable. A motion was made by Alder, seconded by Waters, that the White Plymouth Rock class be used in the contest. Motion was passed. Motion was made by Penquite, seconded by Alder, that the Kansas Leghorns be used. Motion was passed.

The question of using the 365 day egg record or the record to December 1st was raised by one of the coaches. Scott and Goodearl explained their reasons for voting against the motion in the 1930 meeting. Waters moved and the motion was seconded by Alder that the same procedure be followed as last year. Motion was passed.

Steup announced that the following exhibition classes would be used in the Judging Contest: R. I. Red females (pullets), Rhode Island Red cockerels, White Wyandotte pullets, Barred Plymouth Rock pullets, Single Comb White Leghorn cockerels. It was explained that all disqualifications should be overlooked by the competitors in the contest and that they should not be considered as defects. Scott raised the question of the coaches and students seeing the birds after the contest and having the exhibition judge, Mr. Demberger, go over the exhibition classes and explain the reasons for his placings.

It was announced that the banquet would be held at the Auditorium Hotel at 6:30 p. m. A guest list was made up and a poll of the coaches made to determine the number of plates necessary to serve the crowd.

Dr. Card of Illinois, Chairman of the Prize Committee, announced the following prizes:

Cups

Challenge Trophy - U. S. Egg Society, 110 North Franklin St., Chicago, Illinois.

Permanent Cup to Winning Team - Purina Mills, St. Louis, Mo.

Exhibition Cup - Keyes-Davis Company, Battle Creek, Michigan.

Production Cup - Poultry Tribune, Mount Morris, Illinois.

Examination Cup - The Coaches.

Cups

the following prizes:

Dr. Gerd of Illinois, Chairman of the Prize Committee, announced made to determine the number of plates necessary to serve the crowd. Hotel at 6:30 p. m. A guest list was made up and a poll of the coaches was announced that the banquet would be held at the Auditorium classes and explain the reasons for his placing.

and having the exhibition Judge, Mr. Demberger, go over the exhibition question of the coaches and students seeing the birds after the contest and that they should not be considered as defects. Scott raised the qualifications should be overlooked by the competitors in the contest Single Comb White Leghorn cockerels. It was explained that all dis- Red cockerels, White Wyandotte pullets, Barred Plymouth Rock pullets, used in the Judging Contest: R. I. Red females (pullets), Rhode Island Step announced that the following exhibition classes would be same procedure be followed as last year. Motion was passed.

meeting. Waters moved and the motion was seconded by Alder that the explained their reasons for voting against the motion in the 1930 December list was raised by one of the coaches. Scott and Goodberry The question of using the 365 day egg record or the record to Alder, that the Kansas Leghorns be used. Motion was passed.

contest. Motion was made by Penquite, seconded by seconded by Waters, that the White Plymouth Rock class be used in the opinion that the birds were placeable. A motion was made by Alder, high production bird laying about 300 eggs. He also stated as his

Medals

Exhibition Medals - G. E. Conkey Company, Cleveland, Ohio.

Production Medals - Tobacco By-products and Chemical Corp.,
Louisville, Kentucky.

Examination Medals -American Poultry Journal, 536 South Clark
Street, Chicago, Illinois.

Cash

Acetol Products, Inc., 21 Spruce Street, New York City.

Allied Mills, Inc., Board of Trade Building, Chicago, Illinois.

F. E. Booth Company, San Francisco, California.

Columbus Vaccine Company, Columbus, Ohio.

Albert Dickinson Company, Chicago, Illinois.

The Farmer's Wife, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Globe American Corporation, Kokomo, Indiana.

George H. Lee Company, Omaha, Nebraska.

Marden-Wild Corporation, Chicago, Illinois.

Nowak Milling Corporation, Hammond, Indiana.

Oyster Shell Products Corporation, New York City.

Lyman Peck, Merck & Company, Rahway, New Jersey.

Ira M. Petersime and Son, Gettysburg, Ohio.

Poultry Herald, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Poultry Item, Sellersville, Pennsylvania.

Smith Incubator Company, Cleveland, Ohio.

The Swartwout Company, Cleveland, Ohio.

Dr. Card reported that it was somewhat more difficult this year to obtain prizes due to the depression situation. He also suggested that the examination cup be engraved as coming from the coaches. Considerable discussion as to whether the coaches' names who furnish the articles for the poultry paper should be engraved on the cup or whether the cup should be engraved as coming from "The Coaches". Motion was made by Waters, seconded by Embleton, that the prize committee be given power to decide how the cup should be engraved. Motion was passed.

Dr. Card recommended that the \$50.00 cash collected from the Coliseum Floor be added to the \$100.00 cash to make \$150.00 for cash prizes. Discussion resulted as to whether it should be used for medals for the winning team or added to the cash money. The motion was made by Funk, seconded by Waters, that the \$50.00 be added to the \$100.00 cash money. The motion was passed unanimously. Motion was made by Penquite, seconded by Waters, that the prize committee be given power to decide how the \$150.00 cash prizes should be distributed. The motion was

Medals

Exhibition Medals - G. E. Conkey Company, Cleveland, Ohio.
Production Medals - Tobacco By-products and Chemical Corp.,
Louisville, Kentucky.
Examination Medals - American Poultry Journal, 538 South Clark
Street, Chicago, Illinois.

Cash

Acetol Products, Inc., 21 Spruce Street, New York City.
Allied Mills, Inc., Board of Trade Building, Chicago, Illinois.
F. E. Booth Company, San Francisco, California.
Columbus Vaccine Company, Columbus, Ohio.
Albert Dickinson Company, Chicago, Illinois.
The Farmer's Wife, St. Paul, Minnesota.
Globe American Corporation, Kokomo, Indiana.
George H. Lee Company, Omaha, Nebraska.
Marden-Wild Corporation, Chicago, Illinois.
Nowak Milling Corporation, Hammond, Indiana.
Oyster Shell Products Corporation, New York City.
Lyman Peck, Merck & Company, Rahway, New Jersey.
L. M. Petersime and Son, Gettysburg, Ohio.
Poultry Herald, St. Paul, Minnesota.
Poultry Item, Selfersville, Pennsylvania.
Smith Inspector Company, Cleveland, Ohio.
The Swartwout Company, Cleveland, Ohio.

Dr. Card reported that it was somewhat more difficult this year to obtain prizes due to the depression situation. He also suggested that the examination cup be engraved as coming from the coaches. Considerable discussion as to whether the coaches' names who furnish the articles for the poultry paper should be engraved on the cup or whether the cup should be engraved as coming from "The Coaches". Motion was made by Waters, seconded by Emberton, that the prize committee be given power to decide how the cup should be engraved. Motion was passed.

Dr. Card recommended that the \$50.00 cash collected from the Coliseum Floor be added to the \$100.00 cash to make \$150.00 for cash prizes. Discussion resulted as to whether it should be used for medals for the winning team or added to the cash money. The motion was made by Frank, seconded by Waters, that the \$50.00 be added to the \$100.00 cash money. The motion was passed unanimously. Motion was made by Fendrite, seconded by Waters, that the prize committee be given power to decide how the \$150.00 cash prizes should be distributed. The motion was

passed. For the benefit of the prize committee the following suggestions were made. Goodearl suggested that the winning team should receive a portion of it, possibly \$10.00 to each member of the winning team. It was also suggested that cash prizes be given to more than the first 10 high individuals in the contest. Embleton of Arizona moved that the \$50.00 additional cash money be given to the men below the first 10 high men as individual prizes. The motion was seconded by Waters. Embleton with consent of Waters withdrew the motion.

The following committees were appointed:

Examination Committee, Steup, Chairman - Motion was made by Embleton and seconded by Alder that as many members of last year's committee as are present serve with Steup on the examination committee for this year's contest, and that the committee select two men to fill the vacancies. Motion was passed. The following coaches were selected to work with the chairman of the examination committee: Scott, Funk, and Penquite.

Grading Committee, Card, Chairman - Alder made a motion which was seconded by Penquite that the chair appoint the grading committee to serve with Dr. Card. The motion was passed and Mr. Bittenbender appointed Waters and Marble on that committee.

Monitor Committee, Goodearl, Chairman (appointed by the chair), Alder Embleton, and Dakan.

Grade Totaling Committee - Mr. Bittenbender recommended that the same committee serve as last year. Funk made a motion, seconded by Penquite, that this recommendation be accepted. Motion was passed.

A motion was made by Funk, seconded by Dakan, that 15 minutes be allowed for the first class and 12 minutes for each of the other nine classes. Motion was passed. The following instructions were given for judging. All groups including the alternates meet at the Coliseum at 7:50 a. m. for instructions. Group 1 would then go directly to the

passed. For the benefit of the prize committee the following suggestion were made. Goodenall suggested that the winning team should receive a portion of it, possibly \$10.00 to each member of the winning team. It was also suggested that cash prizes be given to more than the first 10 high individuals in the contest. Embleton of Arizona moved that the \$50.00 additional cash money be given to the men below the first 10 high men as individual prizes. The motion was seconded by Waters. Embleton with consent of Waters withdrew the motion.

The following committees were appointed:

Examination Committee, Steup, Chairman - Motion was made by

Embleton and seconded by Alder that as many members of last year's committee as are present serve with Steup on the examination committee for this year's contest, and that the committee select two men to fill the vacancies. Motion was passed. The following coaches were selected to work with the chairman of the examination committee: Scott, Funk, and Penquite.

Grading Committee, Card, Chairman - Alder made a motion which

was seconded by Penquite that the chair appoint the grading committee to serve with Dr. Card. The motion was passed and Mr. Bittenbender appointed Waters and Marble on that committee.

Monitor Committee, Goodenall, Chairman (appointed by the

chair), Alder Embleton, and Dakan.

Grade Totalling Committee - Mr. Bittenbender recommended that

the same committee serve as last year. Funk made a motion, seconded by Penquite, that this recommendation be accepted. Motion was passed. A motion was made by Funk, seconded by Dakan, that 15 minutes be allowed for the first class and 12 minutes for each of the other nine classes. Motion was passed. The following instructions were given for judging. All groups including the alternates meet at the Coliseum at 7:50 a. m. for instructions. Group 1 would then go directly to the

judging of the 10 classes and groups 2 and 3 to the examination room in the New Southern Hotel. At 10:30 group 1 and the alternate were to take the examination and group 2 begin judging. Group 3 was instructed to meet at the Hotel at 12:45 to be taken by the monitor to the Coliseum for judging. Those teams drawing numbers 1 to 5 would start on the ^{exhibition}~~production~~ classes. These two groups were to rotate within the group until each individual had entirely completed the 5 exhibition classes or the 5 production classes, depending upon the classes with which he starts.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p. m.

Signed,

D. R. Marble, Secretary

Judging of the 10 classes and groups 2 and 3 to the examination room in the New Southern Hotel. At 10:30 Group 1 and the alternates were to take the examination and Group 2 begin judging. Group 3 was instructed to meet at the hotel at 12:45 to be taken by the monitor to the Coliseum for judging. Those teams drawing numbers 1 to 5 would start on the ^{exhibition} ~~presentation~~ classes. These two groups were to rotate within the group until each individual had entirely completed the 5 exhibition classes or the 5 production classes, depending upon the classes with which he starts.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p. m.

Signed,

D. R. Marble, Secretary

Minutes of a Meeting of the Coaches of Teams Competing in
The Mid-West Intercollegiate Poultry Judging
Contest, December 5, 1931

The following were present: H. H. Steup, E. M. Funk, H. E. Alder, Geo. P. Goodearl, N. F. Waters, H. M. Scott, E. L. Dakan, L. E. Card, H. A. Bittenbender, and D. R. Marble, and O. B. Kent.

A motion was made by Waters, seconded by Goodearl, that a contest be held at the Coliseum Show next year. The motion was passed. It was explained that possibly the Show would be held one week earlier.

The problem of finding suitable production classes was discussed by Dr. Kent. It was suggested that some emphasis should be placed upon size of bird, size of egg and some factors of importance in production classes.

A motion was made by Waters, seconded by Dakan, that the same officers continue for next year. The motion was passed.

Standing Committees - The executive board shall consist of the chairmen of the various committees and the officers of the association. The following chairmen were appointed; Examination committee, Steup; grading committee, Waters; prize committee, Card.

It was suggested by the chairman, Mr. Bittenbender, that new plans be worked out ^{by} ~~for~~ a representative committee to be presented to all interested institutions for their consideration. This committee should consider such problems as the following: (1) The introduction of meat classes; (2) The introduction of egg classes; (3) The written examination; (4) The condition of the birds in the production classes. It was suggested that possibly a revision of rules for the selection of birds might be desirable. A motion was made by Alder and seconded by Waters that a committee for contest revisions be appointed at this meeting, the committee to consist of three members. The motion was passed unanimously; Dakan

Minutes of a Meeting of the Coaches of Teams Competing in

The Mid-West Intercollegiate Poultry Judging

Contest, December 5, 1931

The following were present: H. H. Steep, E. M. Tunk, H. E. Alder, Geo. P. Goodenry, N. F. Waters, H. M. Scott, E. L. Dakan, L. E. Gerd, H. A. Bittenbender, and O. B. Kent.

A motion was made by Waters, seconded by Goodenry, that a contest be held at the Coliseum Show next year. The motion was passed. It was explained that possibly the show would be held one week earlier. The problem of finding suitable production classes was discussed by Dr. Kent. It was suggested that some emphasis should be placed upon size of bird, size of egg and some factors of importance in production classes.

A motion was made by Waters, seconded by Dakan, that the same officers continue for next year. The motion was passed.

Standing Committees - The executive board shall consist of the chairmen of the various committees and the officers of the association. The following chairmen were appointed: Examination committee, Steep; Grading committee, Waters; prize committee, Gerd.

It was suggested by the chairman, Mr. Bittenbender, that new plans be worked out for a representative committee to be presented to all

interested institutions for their consideration. This committee should

consider such problems as the following: (1) The introduction of meat classes; (2) The introduction of egg classes; (3) The written examination; (4) The condition of the birds in the production classes. It was suggested

that possibly a revision of rules for the selection of birds might be

desirable. A motion was made by Alder and seconded by Waters that a

committee for contest revisions be appointed at this meeting, the committee

to consist of three members. The motion was passed unanimously. Dakan

of Ohio suggested that three states nearby each other be represented in order to get together. He suggested that 3 of the 4 states, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma, be represented on this committee. He made a motion to that effect. Motion was seconded by Alder and passed unanimously. Dakan moved that the chair appoint the 3 states. This was seconded by Goodearl and passed. Dakan moved a revision to the original motion to the effect that representatives from the four states be included on this committee. The motion was seconded by Waters and passed unanimously. It was suggested by Mr. Bittenbender that preliminary plans be started before the Fact Finding Conference on January 19 and 20, and that a meeting be called at that time for consideration of the plans. Mr. Bittenbender appointed Scott of Kansas as chairman of this committee. Mr. Bittenbender further expressed the thought that this should be an institutional problem rather than a coaches problem.

Dakan suggested that Ohio be given permission to send Rhode Island Red females for the production class with permission to condition them for two months prior to the contest. Funk made a motion that the class be accepted. The motion was not seconded.

Waters suggested that a revision of the questions in the written examination was necessary. Dakan of Ohio reported the following with respect to this year's examination: 10% Bantams, 15% Asiatics, 10% water fowls, 4% Rocks (Buff, White and Barred), 3% Leghorns, 2% Reds, 3% Wyandottes, 20% American Breeds (4% on breeds that boys ever saw), 8% English (50% of this on Cornish), 20% Mediterranean (3% on Leghorns). Card suggested to the committee that 3, 4, or 5 part questions on our common varieties be given in the examination instead of 1 or 2 part questions on less common varieties. Scott of Kansas suggested that the examinations should be continued and that the students be held for the glossary of terms and all details on common varieties, but that they be

of Ohio suggested that three states nearly each other be represented in order to get together. He suggested that 3 of the 4 states, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma, be represented on this committee. He made a motion to that effect. Motion was seconded by Alder and passed unanimously. Daken moved that the chair appoint the 3 states. This was seconded by Gooden and passed. Daken moved a revision to the original motion to the effect that representatives from the four states be included on this committee. The motion was seconded by Waters and passed unanimously. It was suggested by Mr. Bittenbender that preliminary plans be started before the East Finding Conference on January 19 and 20, and that a meeting be called at that time for consideration of the plans. Mr. Bittenbender appointed Scott of Kansas as chairman of this committee. Mr. Bittenbender further expressed the thought that this should be an institutional problem rather than a coaches problem.

Daken suggested that Ohio be given permission to send Rhode Island Red females for the production class with permission to condition them for two months prior to the contest. Frank made a motion that the class be accepted. The motion was not seconded.

Waters suggested that a revision of the questions in the written examination was necessary. Daken of Ohio reported the following with respect to this year's examination: 10% Bantams, 15% Asiatics, 10% water fowls, 4% Rocks (Buff, White and Barred), 3% Leghorns, 2% Reds, 3% Wyandottes, 20% American Bred (4% on breeds that boys ever saw), 2% English (50% of this on Cornish), 20% Mediterranean (3% on Leghorns). Gard suggested to the committee that 3, 4, or 5 part questions on our common varieties be given in the examination instead of 1 or 2 part questions on less common varieties. Scott of Kansas suggested that the examinations should be continued and that the students be held for the glossary of terms and all details on common varieties, but that they be

held only for the disqualifications of less common breeds and varieties.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p. m.

Signed,

D. R. Marble, Secretary

held only for the classifications of less common breeds and varieties.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p. m.

Signed,

D. H. Marble, Secretary

Donors of Judging Contest Prizes - 1931

Cups

Challenge Trophy - U. S. Egg Society, 110 North Franklin Street,
Chicago, Illinois
Permanent Cup to Winning Team - Purina Mills, St. Louis, Missouri
Exhibition Cup - Keyes-Davis Company, Battle Creek, Michigan
Production Cup - Poultry Tribune, Mount Morris, Illinois
Examination Cup - The Coaches

Medals

Exhibition Medals - G. E. Conkey Company, Cleveland, Ohio
Production Medals - Tobacco By-products and Chemical Corporation,
Louisville, Kentucky
Examination Medals - American Poultry Journal, 536 South Clark
Street, Chicago, Illinois

Cash

Acetol Products, Inc., 21 Spruce Street, New York City
Allied Mills, Inc., Board of Trade Building, Chicago, Illinois
F. E. Booth Company, San Francisco, California
Columbus Vaccine Company, Columbus, Ohio
Albert Dickinson Company, Chicago, Illinois
The Farmer's Wife, St. Paul, Minnesota
Globe American Corporation, Kokomo, Indiana
George H. Lee Company, Omaha, Nebraska
Marden-Wild Corporation, Chicago, Illinois
Nowak Milling Corporation, Hammond, Indiana
Oyster Shell Products Corporation, New York City
Lyman Peck, Merck & Company, Rahway, New Jersey
Ira M. Petersime and Son, Gettysburg, Ohio
Poultry Herald, St. Paul, Minnesota
Poultry Item, Sellersville, Pennsylvania
Smith Incubator Company, Cleveland, Ohio
The Swartwout Company, Cleveland, Ohio

Twelfth Annual Mid-West Intercollegiate Poultry Judging Contest

Chicago, December 5, 1931

Competing Teams in Order of Final Placing		Score
1. Oklahoma A. and M. College, Stillwater, Oklahoma (A. Floyd, W. Wilson, W. Irwin) R. B. Penquite, Coach		3116.7
2. Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa (H. Coolidge, W. H. Bassett, C. E. Larson) N. F. Waters, Coach		2968.3
3. Kansas State Agr. College, Manhattan, Kansas (J. J. Miller, V. A. Unruh, L. E. Croy) H. M. Scott, Coach		2950.0
4. University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri (Q. Kinder, W. Price, W. Neel) E. M. Funk, Coach		2911.6
5. Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pennsylvania (J. W. Kennedy, W. M. Hartrenft, H. J. Gardner) D. R. Marble, Coach		2905.0
6. North Dakota Agr. College, Fargo, North Dakota (C. Pace, N. Todd, E. Bothun) G. P. Goodearl, Coach		2748.4
7. University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska (W. Meyers, W. W. Burleigh, L. Vance) H. E. Alder, Coach		2726.7
8. University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona (B. Voights, H. Cosper, I. Gee) H. E. Embleton, Coach		2595.1
9. Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio (M. O. Bryan, M. Balliet, E. R. Amist) E. L. Dakan, Coach		2585.1

Twelve High Individuals

1. W. Wilson, Oklahoma tied with	1086.7	7. L. Vance, Nebraska	1001.7
C. E. Larson, Iowa	1086.7	8. W. Neel, Missouri	993.3
3. A. Floyd, Jr., Oklahoma	1016.7	9. J. J. Miller, Kansas	986.7
4. L. E. Croy, Kansas	1015.0	10. H. J. Gardner, Pennsylvania	978.3
5. W. Irwin, Oklahoma	1013.3	11. Q. Kinder, Missouri	975.0
6. W. M. Hartrenft, Penna.	1005.0	12. N. Todd, North Dakota	970.0

Twelfth Annual Mid-West Intercollegiate Poultry Judging Contest

Chicago, December 5, 1931

Score	Competing Teams in Order of Final Placing
3116.7	1. Oklahoma A. and M. College, Stillwater, Oklahoma (A. Floyd, W. Wilson, W. Irwin) R. B. Pendleton, Coach
2968.3	2. Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa (H. Coolidge, W. H. Bassett, C. E. Larson) W. T. Waters, Coach
2950.0	3. Kansas State Agr. College, Manhattan, Kansas (J. J. Miller, V. A. Unruh, L. E. Gray) H. M. Scott, Coach
2911.6	4. University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri (C. Kinder, W. Price, W. Neel) E. M. Frank, Coach
2905.0	5. Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pennsylvania (J. W. Kennedy, W. M. Hartranft, H. J. Gardner) D. R. Marble, Coach
2748.4	6. North Dakota Agr. College, Fargo, North Dakota (C. Pace, N. Todd, E. Bohann) G. F. Gooden, Coach
2726.7	7. University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska (W. Meyers, W. W. Burleigh, L. Vance) H. E. Alder, Coach
2555.1	8. University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona (B. Volante, H. Cooper, L. Gee) H. E. Emberton, Coach
2525.1	9. Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio (M. O. Bryan, M. Balliet, E. R. Amst) E. L. Baker, Coach

Twelve High Individuals

1001.7	1. W. Wilson, Oklahoma	1086.7	7. L. Vance, Nebraska
993.3	C. E. Larson, Iowa	1086.7	8. W. Neel, Missouri
986.7	3. A. Floyd, Jr., Oklahoma	1016.7	9. J. J. Miller, Kansas
978.3	4. L. E. Gray, Kansas	1015.0	10. H. J. Gardner, Pennsylvania
975.0	5. W. Irwin, Oklahoma	1013.3	11. C. Kinder, Missouri
970.0	6. W. M. Hartranft, Penna.	1005.0	12. N. Todd, North Dakota

EXHIBITION JUDGING

Chicago, 1931

	<u>Score</u>
1. Pennsylvania State College	1155
2. Kansas State Agricultural College	1140
3. Oklahoma A. and M. College	1125
4. Ohio State University	1095
5. University of Missouri	1065
6. University of Arizona	1035
7. Iowa State College	995
8. North Dakota Agricultural College	960
9. University of Nebraska	875

High Individuals

1. H. J. Gardner, Pennsylvania	410
2. L. E. Croy, Kansas	410
3. E. R. Amiet, Ohio	410
4. W. Wilson, Oklahoma	410
5. C. E. Larson, Iowa	395
6. V. A. Unruh, Kansas	395
7. B. Voigts, Oklahoma <i>Arizona</i>	395
8. L. Vance, Nebraska	380
9. W. Irwin, Oklahoma	380
10. (W. M. Hartranft, Pennsylvania (M. O. Bryan, Ohio	380 380

LEC:MPS

12-8-31

EXHIBITION JUDGING

Chicago, 1931

Scores

1155	1. Pennsylvania State College
1140	2. Kansas State Agricultural College
1125	3. Oklahoma A. and M. College
1095	4. Ohio State University
1065	5. University of Missouri
1035	6. University of Arizona
995	7. Iowa State College
960	8. North Dakota Agricultural College
875	9. University of Nebraska

High Individuals

410	1. H. J. Gardner, Pennsylvania
410	2. L. E. Gray, Kansas
410	3. E. R. Amiet, Ohio
410	4. W. Wilson, Oklahoma
395	5. C. E. Larson, Iowa
395	6. V. A. Urruth, Kansas
395	7. B. Voigts, Oklahoma
380	8. L. Vance, Nebraska
380	9. W. Irwin, Oklahoma
380	10. (W. M. Hartman, Pennsylvania)
380	(M. O. Bryan, Ohio)

PRODUCTION JUDGING

Chicago, 1931

	<u>Score</u>
1. Oklahoma A. and M. College	1125
2. Iowa State College	1110
3. University of Nebraska	1095
4. Pennsylvania State College	1070
5. North Dakota Agricultural College	1005
6. University of Missouri	980
7. Kansas State Agricultural College	960
8. University of Arizona	890

- - - - -

High Individuals

1. W. M. Hartranft, Pennsylvania	395
2. A. Floyd, Jr., Oklahoma	395
3. C. E. Larson, Iowa	395
4. W. W. Burleigh, Nebraska	380
5. W. Wilson, Oklahoma	380
6. L. Vance, Nebraska	365
7. J. J. Miller, Kansas	365
8. W. H. Bassett, Iowa	365
9. (W. Neel, Missouri	350
(N. Todd, North Dakota	350
(W. Meyers, Nebraska	350
(W. Irwin, Oklahoma	350
(H. Coolidge, Iowa	350

PRODUCTION JUDGING

Chicago, 1931

Score

1125	1. Oklahoma A. and M. College
1110	2. Iowa State College
1095	3. University of Nebraska
1070	4. Pennsylvania State College
1005	5. North Dakota Agricultural College
980	6. University of Missouri
960	7. Kansas State Agricultural College
890	8. University of Arizona
	9. University of Wisconsin

High Individuals

395	1. W. M. Hartman, Pennsylvania
395	2. A. Floyd, Jr., Oklahoma
395	3. C. E. Larson, Iowa
380	4. W. W. Burleigh, Nebraska
380	5. W. Wilson, Oklahoma
365	6. I. Vance, Nebraska
365	7. J. J. Miller, Kansas
365	8. W. H. Bassett, Iowa
350	9. (W. Neel, Missouri)
350	10. (M. Todd, North Dakota)
350	11. (W. Meyers, Nebraska)
350	12. (W. Irwin, Oklahoma)
350	13. (H. Coolidge, Iowa)

WRITTEN EXAMINATION

Chicago, 1931

	<u>Score</u>
1. University of Missouri tied with Oklahoma A. and M. College	866.7 866.7
3. Iowa State College	863.3
4. Kansas State Agricultural College	850.0
5. North Dakota Agricultural College	783.4
6. University of Nebraska	756.7
7. Pennsylvania State College	680.0
8. University of Arizona	640.1
9. Ohio State University	600.1

- - - - -

High Individuals

1. C. E. Larson, Iowa	296.7
2. W. Wilson, Oklahoma	296.7
3. W. Neel, Missouri	293.3
4. V. A. Unruh, Kansas	293.3
5. Q. Kinder, Missouri	290.0
6. (J. J. Miller, Kansas	286.7
(A. Floyd, Jr., Oklahoma	286.7
8. (W. Price, Missouri	283.3
(W. Irwin, Oklahoma	283.3
(H. Coolidge, Iowa	283.3
(W. H. Bassett, Iowa	283.3

WRITTEN EXAMINATION

Chicago, 1931

Score

866.7	1. University of Missouri
866.7	2. tied with Oklahoma A. and M. College
863.3	3. Iowa State College
850.0	4. Kansas State Agricultural College
783.4	5. North Dakota Agricultural College
756.7	6. University of Nebraska
680.0	7. Pennsylvania State College
640.1	8. University of Arizona
600.1	9. Ohio State University

High Individuals

896.7	1. C. E. Larson, Iowa
896.7	2. W. Wilson, Oklahoma
893.3	3. W. Neel, Missouri
893.3	4. V. A. Ulrich, Kansas
890.0	5. G. Kinder, Missouri
886.7	6. (J. J. Miller, Kansas)
886.7	(A. W. Boyd, Jr., Oklahoma)
883.3	8. (W. Price, Missouri)
883.3	(W. Irwin, Oklahoma)
883.3	(H. Coolidge, Iowa)
883.3	(W. H. Bassett, Iowa)

12-9-31
HCO:MPB

(1931)

EXHIBITION

Team	Name of Individual	R.I.Red Pullets	B.P.R. Pullets	Leg. Ckls.	Wyan. Females	R.I.Red Ckls.	Total Score	Indv. Placing	Team Placing
PENN. STATE	J.W.Kennedy	85	70	100	55	55	365		
	W.M.Hartranft	85	85	85	70	55	380	10	
	H. J.Gardner	100	55	70	100	85	410	1	
	Team	270	210	255	225	195	1155		1
MISSOURI	Q.Kinder	85	70	70	100	40	365		
	W.Price	55	85	55	100	55	350		
	W.Neel	70	70	85	85	40	350		
	Team	210	225	210	285	135	1065		5
KANSAS	J.J.Miller	70	55	70	85	55	335		
	V.A.Unruh	70	85	85	70	85	395	6	
	L.E.Croy	85	85	100	55	85	410	2	
	Team	225	225	255	210	225	1140		2
OHIO	M.O.Bryan	85	55	85	85	70	380	10	
	Balliet	70	25	85	70	55	305		
	E.R.Amiet	100	70	85	70	85	410	3	
	Team	255	150	255	225	210	1095		4
NORTH DAKOTA	C.Pace	70	25	70	40	55	260		
	N.Todd	100	70	70	70	40	350		
	E.Bothun	100	85	70	40	55	350		
	Team	270	180	210	150	150	960		8
NEBRASKA	W.Meyers	100	55	70	40	70	235		
	W.W.Burleigh	40	85	40	40	55	260		
	L.Vance	100	70	40	70	100	380	8	
	Team	140	210	150	150	225	875		9
OKLAHOMA	A.Floyd, Jr.	70	70	85	85	25	335		
	W.Wilson	85	70	85	100	70	410	4	
	W.Irwin	85	85	85	55	70	380	9	
	Team	240	225	255	240	165	1125		3
IOWA STATE	H.Coolidge	70	70	85	40	55	320		
	W.H.Bassett	70	100	40	0	70	280		
	C.E.Larson	55	100	55	100	85	395	5	
	Team	195	270	180	140	210	995		7
ARIZONA	B.Voigts	70	85	85	70	85	395	7	
	H.Cosper	85	55	85	70	40	275		
	I.Gee	40	100	85	40	100	365		
	Team	135	240	255	180	225	1035		6

EXHIBITION

Team	Name of Individual	R.I.Red Pullets	B.P.R. Pullets	Leg. Chick.	Wyann. Females	R.I.Red Chick.	Total Score	Indiv. Placing	Team Placing
PENNS. STATE	J.W.Kennedy	85	70	100	55	55	365	10	1
	W.M.Hartman	85	85	85	70	55	380		
	H.J.Gardner	100	55	70	100	85	410		
	Team	270	210	255	225	195	1155		
MISSOURI	G.Kinder	85	70	70	100	40	365	5	2
	W.Price	55	85	55	100	55	350		
	W.Neel	70	70	85	85	40	350		
	Team	210	225	210	285	135	1065		
KANSAS	L.J.Miller	70	55	70	85	55	335	5	2
	V.A.Urban	70	85	85	70	85	395		
	L.E.Grov	85	85	100	55	85	410		
	Team	225	225	255	210	225	1140		
OHIO	M.O.Bryan	85	55	85	85	70	380	10	3
	Belliet	70	55	85	70	55	305		
	E.R.Amst	100	70	85	70	85	410		
	Team	255	150	225	225	210	1065		
NORTH DAKOTA	C.Pace	70	55	70	40	55	280	8	2
	W.Todd	100	70	70	70	40	350		
	E.Bothum	100	85	70	40	55	350		
	Team	270	180	210	150	150	960		
NEBRASKA	W.Meyers	70	55	70	40	70	235	8	2
	W.W.Purleigh	40	85	40	40	55	260		
	L.Vance	100	70	40	70	100	380		
	Team	140	210	150	150	225	875		
OKLAHOMA	A.Floyd, Jr.	70	70	85	85	55	335	11	2
	W.Wilson	85	70	85	100	70	410		
	W.Twin	85	85	85	55	70	380		
	Team	240	225	255	240	165	1125		
IOWA STATE	H.Coolidge	70	70	85	40	55	320	5	1
	W.H.Bassett	70	100	40	0	70	280		
	C.E.Larson	55	100	55	100	85	395		
	Team	195	270	180	140	210	995		
ARIZONA	B.Volgate	70	85	85	70	85	395	1	2
	H.Gosper	85	85	85	70	40	375		
	I.Gee	40	100	85	40	100	365		
	Team	135	240	225	180	225	1005		

PRODUCTION

Team	Name of Individual	R.I.Red	Leg-horn	Wyan-dotte	B.P. Rock	W.P. Rock	Total Score	Indv. Placing	Team Placing
PENN. STATE	J.W.Kennedy	0	70	100	70	100	340	1	4
	W.M.Hartranft	55	100	85	55	100	395		
	H.J.Gardner	55	70	55	70	85	335		
	Team	110	240	240	195	285	1070		
MISSOURI	Q.Kinder	40	85	85	25	85	320	9	6
	W.Price	0	100	70	40	100	310		
	W.Neel	70	85	85	85	25	350		
	Team	110	270	240	150	210	980		
KANSAS	J.J.Miller	85	70	100	55	55	365	7	7
	V.A.Unruh	25	40	85	40	70	260		
	L.E.Croy	85	85	70	55	40	335		
	Team	195	195	255	150	165	960		
OHIO	M.O.Bryan	25	70	70	25	100	290		9
	Balliet	0	55	85	70	85	295		
	E.R.Amiet	40	40	70	55	100	305		
	Team	65	165	225	150	285	890		
NORTH DAKOTA	C.Pace	100	70	85	40	40	335	9	5
	N.Todd	55	100	85	40	70	350		
	E.Bothun	55	40	85	40	100	320		
	Team	210	210	255	120	210	1005		
NEBRASKA	W.Meyers	85	55	55	55	100	350	9	3
	W.W.Burleigh	55	100	70	85	70	380	4	
	L.Vance	55	85	85	40	100	365	6	
	Team	195	240	210	180	270	1095		
OKLAHOMA	A.Floyd, Jr.	40	85	85	85	100	395	2	1
	W.Wilson	55	55	85	85	100	380	5	
	W.Irwin	70	85	100	55	40	350	9	
	Team	165	225	270	225	240	1125		
IOWA STATE	H.Coolidge	70	70	70	40	100	350	9	2
	W.H.Bassett	55	70	70	85	85	365	8	
	C.E.Larson	70	85	85	55	100	395	3	
	Team	195	225	225	180	285	1110		
ARIZONA	B.Voigts	40	70	70	25	100	305		8
	H.Cosper	0	85	70	55	100	310		
	I.Gee	25	55	70	55	100	305		
	Team	65	210	210	135	300	920		

12-17-31
12-18-31
LHC: MRS

Team	Individual	R.I. Red	Leg- Horn	Wyan- dotte	B.P. Rock	W.P. Rock	Total Score	Indv. Placing	Team Placing
ARIZONA	I. Gee	25	210	210	175	100	950	8	
	H. Cooper	0	85	70	55	100	310		
	B. Volter	40	70	70	55	100	305		
STATE A	Team	195	325	325	180	285	1110	5	
IOWA	G. E. Larson	70	85	85	55	100	395	3	
	W. H. Bassett	55	70	70	85	85	365	8	
	H. Goodridge	70	70	70	40	100	350	9	
STATE B	Team	165	225	270	225	240	1125	1	
IOWA	W. Irwin	70	85	100	55	40	350	9	
	W. Wilson	55	55	85	85	100	380	5	
	A. Floyd, Jr.	40	85	85	85	100	395	5	
OKLAHOMA	Team	165	225	270	225	240	1125		
NEBRASKA	L. Vance	55	85	85	40	100	365	6	
	W. W. Burleigh	55	100	70	85	70	380	4	
	W. Meyers	85	55	55	55	100	350	9	
TEAM	Team	210	210	255	150	210	1005	2	
DAKOTA	E. Bottom	55	40	85	40	100	250		
	N. Todd	55	100	85	40	70	350	9	
	C. Pace	100	70	85	40	40	335		
TEAM	Team	65	165	225	150	285	890	9	
OHIO	E. R. Amist	40	40	70	55	100	305		
	Balliet	0	55	85	70	85	295		
	M. O. Bryan	25	70	70	55	100	290		
TEAM	Team	195	195	255	150	165	960	7	
KANSAS	L. E. Gray	85	85	70	55	40	335		
	V. A. Urrish	25	40	85	40	70	260		
	J. J. Miller	85	70	100	55	55	365	7	
TEAM	Team	110	270	240	150	210	980	6	
KANSAS	W. Neel	70	85	85	85	25	350	9	
	W. Price	0	100	70	40	100	310		
	O. Kinder	40	85	85	55	85	350		
TEAM	Team	110	270	240	150	210	980	6	
STATE	E. J. Gardner	55	70	55	70	85	335		
	W. M. Hartman	55	100	85	55	100	395	1	
	J. W. Kennedy	0	70	100	70	100	340		

PRODUCTION

SUMMARY

Team	Name of Individual	Exhibition Score	Placing	Production Score	Placing	Written Exam.	Placing	Total Final Score	Final Place (individual)	Final Place (team)
PENN. STATE	J.W.Kennedy	365		340		216.7		921.7		
	W.M.Hartranft	380	10	395	1	230.0		1005.0	6	
	H.J.Gardner	410	1	335		233.3		978.3	10	
	Team	1155	1	1070	4	680.0	7	2905.0		5
MISSOURI	Q.Kinder	365		320		290.0	5	975.0	11	
	W.Price	350		310		283.3	8	943.3		
	W.Neel	350		350	9	293.3	3	993.3	8	
	Team	1065	5	980	6	866.7	1	2911.6		4
KANSAS	J.J.Miller	335		365	7	286.7	6	986.7	9	
	V.A.Unruh	395	6	260		293.3	4	948.3		
	L.E.Croy	410	2	335		270.0		1015.0	4	
	Team	1140	2	960	7	850.0	4	2950.0		3
OHIO	M.O.Bryan	380	10	290		196.7		866.7		
	Balliet	305		295		196.7		796.7		
	E.R.Amst	410	3	305		206.7		921.7		
	Team	1095	4	890	9	600.1	9	2585.1		9
NORTH DAKOTA	C.Pace	260		335		236.7		831.7		
	N.Todd	350		350	9	270.0		970.0	12	
	E.Bothun	350		320		276.7		946.7		
	Team	960	8	1005	5	783.4	5	2748.4		6
NEBRASKA	W.Meyers	235		350	9	226.7		811.7		
	W.W.Burleigh	260		380	4	273.3		913.3		
	L.Vance	380	8	365	6	256.7		1001.7	7	
	Team	875	9	1095	3	756.7	6	2726.7		7
OKLAHOMA	A.Floyd, Jr.	335		395	2	286.7	6	1016.7	3	
	W.Wilson	410	4	380	5	296.7	2	1086.7	1	
	W.Irwin	380	9	350	9	283.3	8	1013.3	5	
	Team	1125	3	1125	1	866.7	1	3116.7		1
IOWA STATE	H.Coolidge	320		350	9	283.3	8	953.3		
	W.H.Bassett	280		365	8	283.3	8	928.3		
	C.E.Larson	395	5	395	3	296.7	1	1086.7	1	
	Team	995	7	1110	2	863.3	3	2968.3		2
ARIZONA	B.Voigts	395	7	305		176.7		876.7		
	H.Cosper	275		310		216.7		801.7		
	I.Gee	365		305		246.7		916.7		
	Team	1035	6	920	8	640.1	8	2595.1		8

13th ANNUAL INTERCOLLEGIATE POULTRY JUDGING CONTEST

Chicago, Illinois - November 26, 1932

Institution

Kansas State College
University of Missouri
Oklahoma A & M College
Iowa State College
Pennsylvania State College
Texas A & M College
North Dakota Agr. College
University of Illinois

Coach

Professor H. M. Scott
Professor E. M. Funk
Professor R. B. Penquite
Professor N. F. Waters
Professor D. R. Marble
Professor W. F. Munnerlyn
Professor O. A. Barton
Professor H. J. Sloan

Kansas State College Winning Team

Front row: Tom B. Avery, alternate; R. T. Harper; G. C. Moore;
C. H. Anderson, alternate
Back row: H. M. Scott, Coach; J. J. Wardell



Thirteenth Midwest Intercollegiate

Poultry Judging Contest

1932

Packet contains:

1. Letter from Revision Committee to the coaches suggesting changes in content of contest, reducing emphasis on written examination and adding market products.
2. Minutes of meeting of coaches November 25, 1932. Professor H. A. Bittenbender, Iowa State College, Manager of contest.
3. Minutes of meeting of coaches November 26, 1932.
4. Donors of cups, medals, and cash.

Make-up of Contest:

Exhibition Judging - Five four-bird rings

Rhode Island Red Males
Rhode Island Red Females
Barred Plymouth Rock Females
White Leghorn Males
White Plymouth Rock or Buff Wyandottes (if
latter placed on type only)

Production Judging - Five four-bird rings

Rhode Island Red Yearling Hens
Barred Plymouth Rock Yearling Hens
White Wyandotte Yearling Hens
White Plymouth Rock Yearling Hens
White Leghorn Yearling Hens

Written Examination -

Questions on American Standard of Perfection (limited
to cover certain specified areas of standard)

Poultry Products Division - added on an experimental basis
to include: five classes of Market Poultry (a) light
roasters, (b) heavy roasters, (c) light fowl, (d) heavy
fowl, and (e) dressed heavy fowl; and five classes of
Market Eggs (a) three of white eggs, and (b) two of
brown eggs. (Four plates of 10 eggs in a class.)

Scores of Market Division not included in Final Placings.

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE
OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE
DEPARTMENT OF POULTRY HUSBANDRY
MANHATTAN, KANSAS

RECEIVED

OCT 22 1932

AN. HUSB.

October 20, 1932

Coaches and Department Heads:

The revision committee is glad to enclose a copy of its report. The members of the committee fully appreciate the fact that the plan as outlined is not perfect. It has taken years to develop the old type of contest to its present state and we can expect to follow the same path with respect to the market division.

With the exception of the information on eggs, the content of this report has been ready for some time. Up until October 14 the plan for judging eggs was still unsettled. On this date, Mr. Bittenbender and Mr. Steup met with the chairman and discussed the problem of revision. The plan for judging eggs is an outgrowth of this meeting. It was their suggestion that the market classes be increased to ten instead of eight. In view of the fact that some of the coaches favored the judging of dressed birds, it was decided to add this class instead of another live market class.

Several of the coaches have indicated that they will not enter teams in the market division for the reason that they do not have men who are qualified to judge market classes. I wonder if we are not all in the same boat? The market division is to be run on a trial basis for this year and as Penquite so aptly states the situation, "if we don't get in the water, we will never learn to swim." Every team should enter the market division to give it a fair trial and furthermore, unless we do enter we shall have little to work upon to improve the 1933 contest.

Very truly yours,

The Committee

Revised plan for conducting the 1932 Mid-West Intercollegiate
Poultry Judging Contest

The contest will be divided into two main divisions; first, the old contest as conducted in 1931 and second, a separate contest for judging market poultry and eggs.

Schools have the privilege of entering a team in either or both divisions of the contest. At least for this year, the two divisions will be completely separated from each other. Thus there will be a high team for the old type of contest and a high team for products judging. There will be no "all-around" high team. Each coach will have the privilege of using a team member or an entire team for that matter, in each division or has the right to enter separate teams in each division.

Old Type Contest

This division will be conducted as in the past with the same number of classes and questions. In this division, the contestants will place five classes of production birds and a like number of exhibition classes and answer 100 questions over the Standard.

The production classes will consist of females that have finished their first year of production this fall. These classes will be placed on their record up to the time of the contest. Birds selected for the contest should be normal in every respect. The individuals selected for each class should have been hatched on approximately the same date and should have received the same care, feed, and management. Other than these points, the sole basis of selection should rest on the trap nest record irrespective of whether the class is placeable or not as judged by the person responsible for the selection. Birds that are sickly or "unpleasing to the eye", should not be sent to the contest. The selection should be made by someone who has not assisted in training the team. It is suggested that a spread of 15 to 25 eggs exist between individuals in a class.

The exhibition classes will be selected from the show room and placed by a designated judge. If possible, the classes should be made up of young individuals. The following classes will be judged: S.C. Red females, S.C. Red males, White Wyandotte females, Barred Rock females, and S.C. White Leghorn males.

The written examination will cover pages 12 and 13 on nomenclature, the glossary of terms pages 14 to 29 inclusive, instructions to judges from page 32 down to and including "for meat classes" on page 39, for judging in general pages 50 to 56, "cutting for defects" pages 56 to 59 and general disqualifications as they apply only to the following breeds and varieties that are to be covered in detail.

Revised plan for conducting the 1932 Mid-West Intercollegiate
Poultry Judging Contest

The contest will be divided into two main divisions:
First, the old contest as conducted in 1931 and second, a separate
contest for Judging market poultry and eggs.

Schools have the privilege of entering a team in either
or both divisions of the contest. At least for this year, the two
divisions will be completely separated from each other. Thus there
will be a high team for the old type of contest and a high team for
product judging. There will be no "all-around" high team. Each
coach will have the privilege of naming a team member or an entire
team for that matter, in each division or has the right to enter
separate teams in each division.

Old Type Contest

This division will be conducted as in the past with the
same number of classes and questions. In this division, the con-
testants will place live classes of production birds and a like num-
ber of exhibition classes and answer 100 questions over the Standard.

The production classes will consist of females that have
finished their first year of production this fall. These classes
will be placed on their record up to the time of the contest. Birds
selected for the contest should be normal in every respect. The in-
dividuals selected for each class should have been hatched on approxi-
mately the same date and should have received the same care, feed,
and management. Other than these points, the sole basis of selection
should rest on the trap nest record irrespective of whether the se-
lection or not as judged by the person responsible for the se-
lection. Birds that are sickly or "unpleasant to the eye" should
not be sent to the contest. The selection should be made by someone
who has not assisted in training the team. It is suggested that a
spread of 15 to 25 eggs exist between individuals in a class.

The exhibition classes will be selected from the show room
and placed by a designated judge. If possible, the classes should be
made up of young individuals. The following classes will be judged:
S.C. Red females, S.C. Red males, White Wyandotte females, Barred
Rock females, and S.C. White Leghorn males.

The written examination will cover pages 12 and 13 on
nomenclature, the glossary of terms pages 14 to 29 inclusive, in-
structions to judges from page 32 down to and including "on meat
classes" on page 39, for judging in general pages 50 to 56, "cutting
for defects" pages 58 to 59 and general disqualifications as they
apply only to the following breeds and varieties that are to be
covered in detail.

The examination will cover the following breeds and varieties in detail:

<u>American Class</u>	<u>Mediterranean Class</u>
1. Barred Plymouth Rock	1. S. C. White Leghorn
2. White Plymouth Rock	2. S. C. White Minorca
3. White Wyandotte	3. Blue Andalusian
4. S.C.R.I. Red	
5. J. B. Giant	<u>English Class</u>
6. Silver Penciled Plymouth Rock	1. Buff Orpington
7. Partridge Wyandotte	
8. Silver Laced Wyandotte	<u>Ducks</u>
	1. White Pekin
<u>Asiatic Class</u>	<u>Turkeys</u>
1. Light Brahma	1. Bronze
2. Buff Cochin	2. Bourbon Red
3. Black Langshan	
<u>Geese</u>	
1. White Embden	

In addition, the students will be held for the breed and variety disqualifications of the following: All Brown Leghorns, all Anconas, Speckled Sussex, S.S. Hamburg, Mottled Houdan, Silver Campine, B.B. Red Games, Silver Sebright Bantams, Toulouse Geese, White Holland Turkeys, and Narragansett Turkeys.

Thus, for example in the case of Brown Leghorns, the contestant will be held only for the breed disqualifying clause on page 186 and the variety clause on page 198. Questions on this variety will involve color of earlobes; weight; shank color; and positive white in maintail feathers, sickles, and secondaries.

The examination is to be 100 true-false questions similar to the true-false questions given in the 1931 examination; questions not to involve more than two points.

The answers to all questions should be the literal statement made by the American Standard of Perfection, and not the interpretation of a coach or the committee. If the question cannot be answered in this manner, it should be stricken from the list, or left up to the committee on examination for revision.

The 100 questions will be chosen from 15 questions submitted by the coaches of the competing teams. Coaches are requested not to submit more than one question pertaining to plumage color on each of the following patterns: penciled, laced, partridge and bronze.

The examination will cover the following breeds and varieties in detail:

Mediterranean Class

1. S. C. White Laghorn
2. S. C. White Minorca
3. Blue Andalusian

English Class

1. Buff Orpington

Duck

1. White Pekin

Turkey

1. Bronze
2. Bourbon Red

American Class

1. Banded Plymouth Rock
2. White Plymouth Rock
3. White Wyandotte
4. S. C. R. I. Red
5. J. B. Giant
6. Silver Pencilled Plymouth Rock
7. Partridge Wyandotte
8. Silver Laced Wyandotte

Asiatic Class

1. Light Brahma
2. Buff Cochin
3. Black Langshan

Geese

1. White Embden

In addition, the students will be held for the breed and variety designations of the following: All Brown Leghorns, All Anconas, Speckled Sussex, S. S. Hamburg, Mottled Houdan, Silver Campine, B. R. Red Games, Silver Sebright Bantams, Toulouse Geese, White Holland Turkeys, and Narraharat Turkeys.

Thus, for example in the case of Brown Leghorns, the contestant will be held only for the breed designating clause on page 186 and the variety clause on page 188. Questions on this variety will involve color of earlobes; weight; shank color; and positive white in natural feathers, sickles, and secondaries.

The examination is to be 100 true-false questions similar to the true-false questions given in the 1931 examination; questions not to involve more than two points.

The answers to all questions should be the literal statement made by the American Standard of Perfection, and not the interpretation of a coach or the committee. If the question cannot be answered in this manner, it should be stricken from the list, or left up to the committee on examination for revision.

The 100 questions will be chosen from 15 questions submitted by the coaches of the competing teams. Coaches are requested not to submit more than one question pertaining to plumage color on each of the following patterns: pencilled, laced, partridge and bronze.

Poultry Products Division

The five market poultry classes (each class to consist of 4 birds) to be judged are as follows:

I. Live birds

1. Light roasters (males) 4 to 5 lbs.
2. Heavy roasters (males) 5 lbs. and above
3. Light fowl (females) 3 1/2 to 5 lbs.
4. Heavy fowl (females) 5 lbs. and above.

II. Dressed birds

1. Heavy fowl (females) 5 lbs. and above

The birds in each class will be of the same variety. Placings are to be made by comparison. The live classes will be judged alive by contestant and judge. It is suggested that each coach use the following scale of points in training his team to judge live market birds:

1. Fleshing	50
2. Finish	
Skin condition	15
Fat distribution	15
Feathering	10
3. Conformation	10
Total	100

Market Eggs

The five market egg classes (each class to consist of four plates of 10 eggs each) are as follows:

- I. Three classes of white eggs
- II. Two classes of brown eggs

The eggs will be judged by comparison and placed according to their market value. Thus plate 1 will place over plate 2 in the first class because plate 1 has a greater market value, etc. The placings will be scored as in the other phases of the contest. A perfect score for one individual will be 1000 points. These points will be divided equally between market poultry and market eggs.

All eggs will be candled. Weight will be determined by observation.

Mechanics of Contest

Mr. H. A. Bittenbender and Mr. H. H. Steup will assume the responsibility of obtaining all classes and the necessary equipment. They have also agreed to work out a judging schedule to be presented at the coaches' meeting. As the matter now stands the examination will be conducted Friday evening.

Poultry Products Division

The five market poultry classes (each class to consist of 4 birds) to be judged are as follows:

- I. Live birds
 - 1. Light roasters (males) 4 to 5 lbs.
 - 2. Heavy roasters (males) 5 lbs. and above
 - 3. Light fowl (females) 3 1/2 to 5 lbs.
 - 4. Heavy fowl (females) 5 lbs. and above
- II. Pressed birds
 - 1. Heavy fowl (females) 5 lbs. and above

The birds in each class will be of the same variety. Placings are to be made by comparison. The live classes will be judged alive by contestant and judge. It is suggested that each coach use the following scale of points in making his team to judge five market birds:

1. Freshing	20
2. Finish	10
3. Conformation	10
4. Feathering	10
5. Fat distribution	10
6. Skin condition	10
Total	100

Market Eggs

The five market egg classes (each class to consist of four plates of 10 eggs each) are as follows:

- I. Three classes of white eggs
- II. Two classes of brown eggs

The eggs will be judged by comparison and placed according to their market value. Thus plate I will place over plate B in the first class because plate I has a greater market value, etc. The placings will be scored as in the other phases of the contest. A perfect score for one individual will be 1000 points. These points will be divided equally between market poultry and market eggs.

All eggs will be candled. Weight will be determined by observation.

Mechanics of Contests

Mr. H. A. Bitterbecker and Mr. H. F. Steep will assume the responsibility of obtaining all classes and the necessary equipment. They have also agreed to work out a judging schedule to be presented at the coaches meeting. As the matter now stands the examination will be conducted Friday evening.

DEC 3 1932

AN. MUSE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COACHES OF THE TEAMS COMPETING IN THE
MID-WEST INTERCOLLEGIATE POULTRY JUDGING CONTEST
NOVEMBER 25, 1932

The meeting was called to order by the chairman, H. A .
Bittenbender, at 4:00 P. M.

The following persons were present:

E. M. Funk	Missouri
N. F. Waters	Iowa State
H. J. Sloan	Illinois
H. M. Scott	Kansas
R. Penquite	Oklahoma
W. F. Munnerlyn	Texas
O. A. Barton	North Dakota
L. E. Card	Illinois
H. H. Steup	Poultry Tribune
H. A. Bittenbender	Buckeye Incubator Co.
D. R. Marble	Penn State

Mr. Bittenbender, chairman of the meeting, reported the following arrangements for the contest to be held on Saturday, November 26.

The egg judging was arranged in the South Hall with three classes of white eggs and two classes of brown eggs. Ten eggs per plate. Dr. Sharpe of Cornell was the official judge for the egg classes.

The judging of the exhibition, production and market meat classes was arranged in the center of the Main Hall. The exhibition classes were to be judged by Mr. Demberger and the market classes by Dr. O. B. Kent.

The production classes for the contest were supplied by the following institutions:

Rhode Island Red hens	Illinois
Barred Plymouth Rock hens	Oklahoma
White Wyandotte hens	Iowa State
White Rock hens	Missouri
S. C. W. Leghorn hens	Kansas and Michigan
(Michigan birds were used)	

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF THE YEARS COMPLETING IN THE
MID-WEST INTERSTATE BIRDS' JUDGING CONTEST
NOVEMBER 22, 1933

The meeting was called to order by the chairman, H. A. Mittenbender, at 4:00 P. M.

The following persons were present:

- | | |
|------------------------|--------------------|
| Missouri | W. H. Smith |
| Iowa State | W. F. Waters |
| Illinois | H. J. Olson |
| Kansas | H. W. Scott |
| Oklahoma | R. Pennington |
| Texas | E. P. Munterlyn |
| North Dakota | G. A. Barron |
| Illinois | L. E. Card |
| Polity Tribune | E. H. Steggs |
| Brooklyn Insurance Co. | H. A. Mittenbender |
| Penn State | D. H. Harris |

Mr. Mittenbender, chairman of the meeting, reported the following arrangements for the contest to be held on Saturday,

November 23.

The egg judging was arranged in the North Hall with three classes of white eggs and two classes of brown eggs. Ten

eggs per plate. Mr. Sharpe of Cornell was the official judge for the egg classes.

The judging of the exhibition, production and market classes was arranged in the center of the Main Hall. The exhibition classes were to be judged by Mr. Demberger and the market classes by Dr. O. S. Kent.

The production classes for the contest were supplied by

the following institutions:

- | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Illinois | Rhode Island Red hens |
| Oklahoma | Barred Plymouth Rock hens |
| Iowa State | White Wyandotte hens |
| Missouri | White Rock hens |
| Kansas and Michigan | S. C. W. Leghorn hens |
- (Michigan birds were used)

The production classes were to be placed upon the basis of total egg production up to the day of shipment. In many cases this record would cover more than a twelve month period.

The following classes of birds were to be used in the exhibition judging division:

Rhode Island Red males
Rhode Island Red females
Barred Plymouth Rock females
S. C. W. Leghorn males

This left one class of exhibition birds to be arranged for and Mr. Bittenbender stated that there was an alternative of using Buff Wyandottes to be placed on type or White Plymouth Rocks in place of the White Wyandotte class. A class of White Wyandottes was not available because of insufficient number of White Wyandottes in the show. A Motion was made by Waters of Iowa State that the White Rock class be used. The motion was seconded by Barton of North Dakota. The motion was passed by vote of six to two. Later a telephone call from the Coliseum show informed the chairman of the meeting that the White Rocks were not available because the owners did not wish to have them used for that purpose.

Barton of North Dakota moved that the Buff Wyandotte be used, this class to be judged on type only. The motion was seconded by Funk and passed unanimously.

The motion was made by Penquite of Oklahoma that Barred Plymouth Rock pullets, light mating, be used in the Barred Plymouth Rock class. The motion was seconded by Barton and passed unanimously.

ALL BIRDS

The protection classes were to be placed upon the basis of total egg production up to the day of shipment. In many cases this record would cover more than a twelve month period.

The following classes of birds were to be used in the

exhibition judging divisions:

- Rhode Island Red males
- Rhode Island Red females
- Barred Plymouth Rock females
- B. C. W. Leghorn males

This last one class of exhibition birds to be arranged

for and Mr. Stenroos stated that there was an alternative of using Bull Wyandottes to be placed on type or White Plymouth Rocks in place of the White Wyandotte class. A class of White Wyandottes was not available because of insufficient number of White Wyandottes in the show. A motion was made by letters of loss state that the White Rock class be used. The motion was seconded by Barton of North Dakota. The motion was carried by vote of six to two. Later a telephone call from the Collinses show informed the chairman of the meeting that the White Rocks were not available because the owners did not wish to have them used for that purpose.

Barton of North Dakota moved that the Bull Wyandotte be used, this class to be judged on type only. The motion was seconded by Penn and passed unanimously.

The motion was made by Pennette of Oklahoma that Barred Plymouth Rock pullets, light mating, be used in the Barred Plymouth Rock class. The motion was seconded by Barton and passed unanimously.

B. C. W. Leghorn males

Instructions were given for judging the market egg classes on the basis of market value. No plates of eggs were to be disqualified. In case individual eggs in the entry were disqualified the entry should be judged on the basis of the remaining number of good eggs. Instructions were also given to ignore checked eggs since there was danger of checking during the judging.

There was considerable discussion concerning the method of arranging the judging in the market products division. The motion was made by Barton that market poultry classes be conducted in the same way that the egg classes were planned; namely, two men to a class with 24 minutes allowed for placing the classes. The motion was not seconded. The motion was made by Penquite that 12 minutes be allowed on market poultry classes. This motion was seconded by Barton and passed unanimously.

It was decided that the parties competing in the market products division would be allowed to compete in that same division next year since the contest this year was to be conducted in the form of an experiment.

The order of drawing for the line-up of the contestants results as follows:

Team #1	Missouri
" #2	Illinois
" #3	Penn State
" #4	Oklahoma
" #5	Kansas
" #6	Iowa State
" #7	Texas
" #8	North Dakota

Instructions were given for judging the market egg classes on the basis of market value. No plates of eggs were to be disqualified. In case individual eggs in the entry were disqualified the entry should be judged on the basis of the remaining number of good eggs. Instructions were also given to ignore checked eggs since there was danger of checking during the judging.

There was considerable discussion concerning the method of arranging the judging in the market products division. The motion was made by Horton that market poultry classes be conducted in the same way that the egg classes were judged; namely, two men to a class with 24 minutes allowed for judging the classes. The motion was not seconded. The motion was made by Horton that 12 minutes be allowed on market poultry classes. This motion was seconded by Horton and passed unanimously. It was decided that the parties competing in the market products division would be allowed to compete in that same division next year since the contest this year was to be conducted in the form of an experiment.

The order of drawing for the line-up of the contestants results as follows:

Missouri	41
Illinois	42
Penn State	43
Oklahoma	44
Kansas	45
Iowa State	46
Texas	47
North Dakota	48

The classes were numbered as follows:

The motion was made by waters that the entire group meet after the ex-
Exhibition classes 1 - 5
Production classes 6 - 10
Live Poultry for meat 11 - 14
Dressed Poultry 15
White Eggs 16 - 18
Brown Eggs and Penquite 19 - 20

It was Teams 1-5, man 1, were to start on exhibition classes; teams 6-8, man 1, were to start on production classes; teams 1-8, man 2, were to start on market poultry classes (idle 1 hr.), and teams 1-8, man 3, were to start on market eggs. Two hours were to be allowed for judging each of the three divisions. Rotation of men should be from exhibition and production judging to market classes and then to the market egg classes.

The following committees were appointed by the chairman:

Examination Committee

Steup, Chairman
Funk
Penquite

Grading Committee

Waters, Chairman
Card
Marble

Monitor Committee

Barton
Sloan
Munnerlyn
Scott

EXAMINATION:

Steup stated that the examination list contained 115 questions. The motion was made by Penquite that 115 questions be answered by the contestants and graded on the basis of the first 100 answerable questions. The motion was seconded by Funk and passed unanimously.

The motion was made by Watson that the entire group meet after the examination had been completed to decide which 100 questions should be used. The motion was seconded by Scott and was passed with Olson and Penicote voting against the motion. It was agreed that 15 hours be allowed for the examination. The banquet for Saturday evening was announced for 8:00 P. M. at the Auditorium Hotel.

D. H. Martin, Secretary

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COACHES OF THE TEAMS COMPETING IN THE
MID-WEST INTERCOLLEGIATE POULTRY JUDGING CONTEST
NOVEMBER 26, 1932

RECEIVED
DEC 3 1932

The meeting was called to order by the chairman, H. A. Bittenbender, at 9:00 P. M. **AN. HUSB.**

The following persons were present:

E. M. Funk	Missouri
N. F. Waters	Iowa State
H. J. Sloan	Illinois
H. M. Scott	Kansas
R. Penquite	Oklahoma
W. F. Munnerlyn	Texas
O. A. Barton	North Dakota
L. E. Card	Illinois
H. H. Steup	Poultry Tribune
H. A. Bittenbender	Buckeye Incubator Co.
O. B. Kent	Chicago
D. R. Marble	Penn State

The motion was made by Funk that the contest be held next year. Penquite seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

Mr. Bittenbender told the group that probably the Chicago Coliseum Show would be held in October next year in connection with the World's Fair. This would mean that the judging contest would come four weeks earlier than it came this year. Several possibilities of handling the contest next year were suggested. It was suggested that it might be held in connection with the International or in connection with the Dressed Poultry Show in January. It was also suggested by Funk that it might be held at Kansas City in connection with the Kansas City Royal. The general sentiment of the group seemed to be that the advantages of holding it in connection with the World's Fair would out-weigh the disadvantages.

RECEIVED
DEC 3 1933

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COACHES OF THE TEAMS COMPETING IN THE
ALL-STATE INTERCOLLEGIATE POULTRY JUDGING CONTEST
NOVEMBER 20, 1933

AN HUSB

The meeting was called to order by the chairman, Mr. A. H. HUBBARD, at 8:00 P. M.

The following persons were present:

- | | |
|--------------|--------------------|
| Missouri | W. E. Funn |
| Low State | H. L. Bakers |
| Illinois | H. A. Bickel |
| Kansas | H. E. Scott |
| Oklahoma | H. Pennington |
| Texas | W. F. Kinnerly |
| North Dakota | O. A. Barton |
| Illinois | L. E. Card |
| Indiana | H. H. Stearns |
| Indiana | H. A. Bittenbender |
| Chicago | G. S. Kent |
| Low State | D. H. Harbale |

The motion was made by Funn that the contest be held next year. Pennington seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously. Mr. Bittenbender told the group that probably the Chicago Cattle Show would be held in October next year in connection with the World's Fair. This would mean that the judging contest would come four weeks earlier than it came this year. Several possibilities of handling the contest next year were suggested. It was suggested that it might be held in connection with the International or in connection with the Pressed Poetry Show in January. It was also suggested by Funn that it might be held at Kansas City in connection with the Kansas City Royal. The general sentiment of the group seemed to be that the advantages of holding it in connection with the World's Fair would outweigh the disadvantages.

The discussion ended with the suggestion that a committee composed of Bittenbender, Steup, and Kent obtain information as it became available and pass it on to the coaches. The final decision as to time and place of the contest would then be decided.

DISCUSSION OF THE WRITTEN EXAMINATION

The suggestion was made that the written examination be eliminated. This suggestion was not favorably received by the group. A suggestion was made that the preparation of the questions for the written examination be put into the hands of disinterested parties. Penquite suggested that we cut down the value of the written examination so that the teams could not win as a result of a high score on the examination.

Waters passed on to the group a suggestion made by Dr. Henderson of Iowa State that the written examination be counted with the exhibition judging rather than counting it as a separate portion of the contest.

Bittenbender suggested that a committee composed of Steup, Kent and Demberger submit a plan to the coaches for their consideration. If the plan is not acceptable a written examination would not be given next year.

The motion was made by Penquite that the written examination be discontinued. The motion was seconded by Scott. In the discussion of this motion Funk expressed the opinion that the examination should be left in the hands of a neutral committee. The motion was lost by an unanimous vote.

The discussion ended with the suggestion that a committee composed of Altshuler, Green, and Kent obtain information as to the best available and pass it on to the contest. The final decision as to time and place of the contest would then be decided.

DISCUSSION OF THE WRITTEN EXAMINATION

The suggestion was made that the written examination be eliminated. This suggestion was not favorably received by the group. A suggestion was made that the presentation of the questions for the written examination be put into the hands of disinterested parties. Penhale suggested that we cut down the value of the written examination so that the team could not win as a result of a high score on the examination.

Letters passed on to the group a suggestion made by Dr. Henderson of Iowa State that the written examination be counted with the exhibition judging rather than counting it as a separate portion of the contest.

Altshuler suggested that a committee composed of Green,

Kent and DeBerger submit a plan to the coaches for their consideration. If the plan is not acceptable a written examination would not be given next year.

The motion was made by Penhale that the written examination

be discontinued. The motion was seconded by Scott. In the dis-

cussion of this motion Frank expressed the opinion that the examination should be left in the hands of a neutral committee. The motion was lost by an unanimous vote.

The motion was made by Funk that the same management be retained for the next year. Penquite seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

Barton then made a motion that the matter of questions for the written examination be left to the management committee and that the committee appoint an A.P.A. judge and one other outside man to work with Steup in preparing the examination. Kent suggested that the man in charge of the Standard Revision Committee be the representative from the A.P.A. The motion was seconded by Funk. The vote on the motion was as follows: Yes 4; No 4. The chairman of the meeting then cast his vote with the no's. The motion was lost. The chairman explained his vote by stating that Steup had planned to send out to all the coaches a final plan for their consideration. It was agreed that this procedure be followed.

It was also agreed that the decision for next year's written examination should be dependant upon a majority vote of the institutions voting on the plan submitted by Steup. In case a majority of the institutions voted in favor of the plan it would be used in 1938.

POULTRY PRODUCTS DIVISION

Scott suggested that considerable revision was desirable in changing the score card for placing the market poultry classes. He pointed out the fact that probably 10 points on feather condition in market birds would be acceptable for white birds, but that this was not a large enough allowance for dark colored birds.

The motion was made by Funk that the same management be retained for the next year. Pennington seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

Horton then made a motion that the matter of questions for the written examination be left to the management committee and that the committee appoint an A.P.A. judge and one other outside man to work with Steep in preparing the examination. Kent suggested that the man in charge of the Standard Revision Committee be the representative from the A.P.A. The motion was seconded by Funk.

The vote on the motion was as follows: Yes 4; No 4. The chairman of the meeting then cast his vote with the no's. The motion was lost. The chairman explained his vote by stating that Steep had planned to send out to all the coaches a final plan for their consideration. It was agreed that this procedure be followed.

It was also agreed that the decision for next year's written examination should be dependent upon a majority vote of the institutions voting on the plan submitted by Steep. In case a majority of the institutions voted in favor of the plan it could be used in 1955.

COUNTRY PROPOSED DIVISION

Scott suggested that considerable revision was desirable in changing the score card for placing the market poultry classes. He pointed out the fact that probably 10 points on feather condition in market birds would be acceptable for white birds, but that this was not a large enough allowance for dark colored birds.

Donors of Judging Contest Prizes - 1932

Cups

Challenge Trophy - U. S. Egg Society. Now the Institute of American Poultry Industries, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Illinois.

Permanent cup to winning team - Purina Mills, St. Louis, Missouri.

Exhibition cup - Keyes-Davis Co., Battle Creek, Michigan.

Production cup - Poultry Tribune, Mt. Morris, Illinois.

Examination cup - Joint contributions from the following firms represented at the 1932 Coliseum Show:

Acetol Products, Inc., 21 Spruce St., N. Y. City
Poultry Item, Sellersville, Pennsylvania
Poultry Supply Dealer, Chicago, Illinois
Grandview Poultry Farm, Zeeland, Michigan
Hawkins' Million Dollar Hen, Mt. Vernon, Illinois

Medals

Exhibition Medals - G. E. Conkey Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

Production Medals - Tobacco By-Products and Chemical Corporation, Louisville, Kentucky.

Examination Medals - American Poultry Journal, 536 South Clark Street, Chicago, Illinois.

Cash

Allied Mills, Inc., Board of Trade Building, Chicago, Illinois.

Donors of Judging Contest Prizes - 1933

Cups

Challenge Trophy - U. S. Egg Society. Now the Institute of American Poultry Industries, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Illinois.

Permanent cup to winning team - Purins Mills, St. Louis, Missouri.

Exhibition cup - Keyes-Davis Co., Battle Creek, Michigan.

Production cup - Poultry Tribune, Mt. Morris, Illinois.

Examination cup - Joint contributions from the following firms represented at the 1933 Coliseum Show:

Acetol Products, Inc., 31 Spruce St., N. Y. City
Poultry Item, Sellersville, Pennsylvania
Poultry Supply Dealer, Chicago, Illinois
Grandview Poultry Farm, Neeland, Michigan
Hawkins, Million Dollar Hen, Mt. Vernon, Illinois

Medals

Exhibition Medals - G. E. Conkey Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

Production Medals - Tobacco By-Products and Chemical Corporation, Louisville, Kentucky.

Examination Medals - American Poultry Journal, 538 South Clark Street, Chicago, Illinois.

Cash

Allied Mills, Inc., Board of Trade Building, Chicago, Illinois.

The motion was made by Penquite that a committee be appointed by the chairman to summarize the results secured in this year's contest and submit them to the coaches. The motion was seconded by Barton. It was agreed that Waters of Iowa State should send out the results of this year's contest to each coach, the teams to be indicated by number rather than by name, and that as much information as possible be obtained regarding the training and experience of the individual contestants.

The motion was made by Penquite, seconded by Funk, that the market products division be continued for next year with the present committee continuing to function. This committee during the past year was: Scott, Waters, Penquite and Funk. The motion was passed.

Dr. Kent suggested that the classification of light roasters and fowls be changed with respect to weight.

The motion was made by Funk, seconded by Penquite, that the market products division be retained as a separate division of the contest. The motion was carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 11:15 P. M.

D. R. Marble, Secretary

The motion was made by Pennington that a committee be appointed by the chairman to summarize the results secured in this year's contest and submit them to the coaches. The motion was seconded by Barton. It was agreed that letters of Iowa State should send out the results of this year's contest to each coach, the teams to be indicated by number rather than by name, and that as much information as possible be obtained regarding the training and experience of the individual contestants. The motion was made by Pennington, seconded by Funk, that the market products division be continued for next year with the present committee continuing to function. This committee during the past year was: Scott, Wertz, Pennington and Funk. The motion was passed.

Dr. Kent suggested that the classification of light roasters and lows be changed with respect to weight. The motion was made by Funk, seconded by Pennington, that the market products division be retained as a separate division of the contest. The motion was carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 11:15 P. M.

L. A. Mawds, Secretary

13th Mid-West Intercollegiate Poultry Judging Contest

Chicago, November 26, 1932

Competing Teams in Order of Final Placing	Score
1. Kansas State Agr. College, Manhattan, Kansas (J. J. Wardell, G. Moore, R. T. Harper) H. M. Scott, Coach	3200.0
2. University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri (R. Irwin, R. Scoville, R. Hargrave) E. M. Funk, Coach	2978.3
3. Oklahoma A. and M. College, Stillwater, Oklahoma (V. Stratton, C. Wann, H. Lasater) R. B. Penquite, Coach	2943.4
4. Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa (R. Heeren, H. Boynton, F. Bartlett) N. F. Waters, Coach	2903.4
5. Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pennsylvania (P. F. Rubinkam, R. Yoselson, E. L. Veety) D. R. Marble, Coach	2871.7
6. Texas A. and M. College, College Station, Texas (R. R. Thompson, P. D. Sturkie, T. B. Sebastian) W. F. Munnerlyn, Coach	2813.4
7. North Dakota Agr. College, Fargo, North Dakota (B. Curtis, N. Peck, J. Hamre) O. A. Barton, Coach	2800.0
8. University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois (G. H. Hyde, S. W. Hinners, F. S. Hooper) H. J. Sloan, Coach	2621.6

Ten High Individuals

1. J. J. Wardell, Kansas	1098.3	6. R. Heeren, Iowa	1011.7
2. R. T. Harper, Kansas	1080.0	7. H. Lasater, Oklahoma	996.7
3. V. Stratton, Oklahoma	1075.0	8. P. D. Sturkie, Texas	981.7
4. R. Irwin, Missouri	1040.0	9. R. Scoville, Missouri	978.3
5. G. Moore, Kansas	1021.7	10. R. Yoselson, Penna.	976.7

1932

High Individuals All-Around

Placing	Name	Team	Score	Prize
1	Wardell	Kansas	1098.3	15 ⁰⁰
2	Harper	Kansas	1080.0	10 ⁰⁰
3	Stratton	Okla	1075.0	5 ⁰⁰
4	Irwin	Mo.	1040.0	5 ⁰⁰
5	Moore	Kansas	1021.7	5 ⁰⁰
6	Heeren	Iowa	1011.7	5 ⁰⁰
7	Pasater	Okla	996.7	5 ⁰⁰
8	Sturkie	Texas	981.7	3 ⁰⁰
9	Seaville	Mo.	978.3	3 ⁰⁰
10	Yoselson	Penn.	976.7	3 ⁰⁰

Purina Mills

High Teams All Around

Placing	Team	Score	Prize
1	Kansas	3200.0	Circulating Trophy - US Egg Society
2	Missouri	2978.3	Permanent Cup - Purina Mills.
3	Oklahoma	2943.4	
4	Iowa State	2903.4	
5	Penn. State	2871.7	
6	Texas	2813.4	
7	N. Dakota	2800.0	
8	Illinois	2621.6	

Place	Time	Score	Place
1	10:00	100	1
2	10:01	100	2
3	10:02	100	3
4	10:03	100	4
5	10:04	100	5
6	10:05	100	6
7	10:06	100	7
8	10:07	100	8
9	10:08	100	9
10	10:09	100	10
11	10:10	100	11
12	10:11	100	12
13	10:12	100	13
14	10:13	100	14
15	10:14	100	15
16	10:15	100	16
17	10:16	100	17
18	10:17	100	18
19	10:18	100	19
20	10:19	100	20

High Team

Place	Time	Score	Place
1	10:00	100	1
2	10:01	100	2
3	10:02	100	3
4	10:03	100	4
5	10:04	100	5
6	10:05	100	6
7	10:06	100	7
8	10:07	100	8
9	10:08	100	9
10	10:09	100	10
11	10:10	100	11
12	10:11	100	12
13	10:12	100	13
14	10:13	100	14
15	10:14	100	15
16	10:15	100	16
17	10:16	100	17
18	10:17	100	18
19	10:18	100	19
20	10:19	100	20

High Individuals Exhibition

Placing	Name	Team	Score	Prize
1	Irwin	Mo.	410	Gold Medal
2	Stratton	Okla.	390	Silver Medal
3	Wardell	Kansas	370	Bronze Medal
4	Rasater	Okla.	355	
5	Harper	Kansas	345	
6	Curtis	N. Dak.	340	
7	Yoselson	Penn. State	340	
8	Hawes	N. Dak.	335	
9	Hargrave	Mo.	330	
10	Moore	Kansas	330	

G. Conkey

High Teams Exhibition

Placing	Team	Score	Prize
1	Missouri	1055	Silver Cup - Keyes Davis Co.
2	Kansas	1045	
3	Oklahoma	1035	
4	N. Dakota	970	
5	Texas	925	
6	Penn State	920	
7	Iowa State	900	
8	Illinois	730	

Handwriting

Placing	Name	Score	Prize
1	William	95	1st
2	William	90	2nd
3	William	85	3rd
4	William	80	4th
5	William	75	5th
6	William	70	6th
7	William	65	7th
8	William	60	8th
9	William	55	9th
10	William	50	10th
11	William	45	11th
12	William	40	12th
13	William	35	13th
14	William	30	14th
15	William	25	15th
16	William	20	16th
17	William	15	17th
18	William	10	18th
19	William	5	19th
20	William	0	20th

High Score

Placing	Name	Score	Prize
1	William	95	1st
2	William	90	2nd
3	William	85	3rd
4	William	80	4th
5	William	75	5th
6	William	70	6th
7	William	65	7th
8	William	60	8th
9	William	55	9th
10	William	50	10th
11	William	45	11th
12	William	40	12th
13	William	35	13th
14	William	30	14th
15	William	25	15th
16	William	20	16th
17	William	15	17th
18	William	10	18th
19	William	5	19th
20	William	0	20th

High Individuals

Production

Placing	Name	Team	Score	Prize
1	Harper	Kansas	435	Gold Medal
2	Stratton	Okla	435	Silver Medal
3	Heeren	Iowa	430	Bronze Medal
4	Wardell	Kansas	425	
5	Vesty	Penn	400	
6	Himmere	Ill.	400	
7	Hyde	Ill.	395	
8	Sturkie	Texas	395	
9	Bartlett	Iowa	385	
10	Moore	Kansas	385	
	Rubinskam	Penn.	385	

 Tobacco
By Products

High Teams

Production

Placing	Team	Score	Prize
1	Kansas	1245	Silver Cup - Poultry Tribune
2	Okla Home	1155	
3	Penn. State	1155	
4	Illinois	1145	
5	Iowa State	1140	
6	Texas	1115	
7	N. Dakota	1090	
8	Missouri	1020	

High Individual

Place	Name	Time	Score	Points
1	...	...	...	...
2	...	...	...	...
3	...	...	...	...
4	...	...	...	...
5	...	...	...	...
6	...	...	...	...
7	...	...	...	...
8	...	...	...	...
9	...	...	...	...
10	...	...	...	...
11	...	...	...	...
12	...	...	...	...
13	...	...	...	...
14	...	...	...	...
15	...	...	...	...
16	...	...	...	...
17	...	...	...	...
18	...	...	...	...
19	...	...	...	...
20	...	...	...	...

High Team

Place	Name	Score	Points
1	...	...	...
2	...	...	...
3	...	...	...
4	...	...	...
5	...	...	...
6	...	...	...
7	...	...	...
8	...	...	...
9	...	...	...
10	...	...	...
11	...	...	...
12	...	...	...
13	...	...	...
14	...	...	...
15	...	...	...
16	...	...	...
17	...	...	...
18	...	...	...
19	...	...	...
20	...	...	...

High Individuals

Examination

Placing	Name	Team	Score	Prize
1	Stargrave	Mo.	310.0	Gold Medal
2	Moore	Kansas	306.7	Silver Medal
3	Wardell (Sund)	Kansas	303.3	Bronze Medal
	Scoville	Mo.	303.3	Bronze Medal
5	Harper	Kansas	300.0	
6	Heeren	Iowa	296.7	
7	Duwin	Mo.	290.0	
8	Boynton	Iowa	286.7	
9	Bartlett	Iowa	280.0	
10	Lesater	Okla	276.7	

Anna Condit

High Teams

Exam.

Placing	Team	Score	Prize
1	Kansas	910.0	Silver Cup
2	Missouri	903.3	
3	Iowa State	863.4	
4	Penn. State	796.7	
5	Texas	773.4	
6	Oklahoma	753.4	
7	Illinois	746.6	
8	N. Dakota	740.0	

Place	Name	Score	Time
1	John Doe	100	1:00
2	Jane Smith	95	1:05
3	Bob Johnson	90	1:10
4	Alice Brown	85	1:15
5	Charlie White	80	1:20
6	Diana Green	75	1:25
7	Frank Black	70	1:30
8	Grace King	65	1:35
9	Henry Lee	60	1:40
10	Ivy Hill	55	1:45
11	Jack Adams	50	1:50
12	Karen Baker	45	1:55
13	Liam Clark	40	2:00
14	Mia Evans	35	2:05
15	Noah Foster	30	2:10
16	Olivia Gibson	25	2:15
17	Peter Hall	20	2:20
18	Quinn Harris	15	2:25
19	Rachel Ives	10	2:30
20	Samuel Jones	5	2:35

Place	Name	Score	Time
1	Thomas King	100	1:00
2	Victoria Lee	95	1:05
3	William Hill	90	1:10
4	Xavier Scott	85	1:15
5	Yvonne Adams	80	1:20
6	Zoe Baker	75	1:25
7	Adam Clark	70	1:30
8	Bella Evans	65	1:35
9	Caleb Foster	60	1:40
10	Dora Gibson	55	1:45
11	Ethan Hall	50	1:50
12	Fiona Harris	45	1:55
13	George Ives	40	2:00
14	Hannah Jones	35	2:05
15	Isaac King	30	2:10
16	Julia Lee	25	2:15
17	Kyle Hill	20	2:20
18	Laura Scott	15	2:25
19	Michael Adams	10	2:30
20	Natalie Baker	5	2:35

High Individual

Ranking	Time	Score	Price
1	1:00.00	100	100
2	1:01.00	95	95
3	1:02.00	90	90
4	1:03.00	85	85
5	1:04.00	80	80
6	1:05.00	75	75
7	1:06.00	70	70
8	1:07.00	65	65
9	1:08.00	60	60
10	1:09.00	55	55
11	1:10.00	50	50
12	1:11.00	45	45
13	1:12.00	40	40
14	1:13.00	35	35
15	1:14.00	30	30
16	1:15.00	25	25
17	1:16.00	20	20
18	1:17.00	15	15
19	1:18.00	10	10
20	1:19.00	5	5

High Team

Ranking	Team	Score	Price
1	Team A	100	100
2	Team B	95	95
3	Team C	90	90
4	Team D	85	85
5	Team E	80	80
6	Team F	75	75
7	Team G	70	70
8	Team H	65	65
9	Team I	60	60
10	Team J	55	55
11	Team K	50	50
12	Team L	45	45
13	Team M	40	40
14	Team N	35	35
15	Team O	30	30
16	Team P	25	25
17	Team Q	20	20
18	Team R	15	15
19	Team S	10	10
20	Team T	5	5

High Individuals Market Eggs

[illegible]

High Teams _____

[illegible]

High School

Place	Score	Team	Place
1	200	1st	1
2	180	2nd	2
3	160	3rd	3
4	140	4th	4
5	120	5th	5
6	100	6th	6
7	80	7th	7
8	60	8th	8
9	40	9th	9
10	20	10th	10
11	0	11th	11
12	0	12th	12
13	0	13th	13
14	0	14th	14
15	0	15th	15
16	0	16th	16
17	0	17th	17
18	0	18th	18
19	0	19th	19
20	0	20th	20

High School

Place	Score	Team	Place
1	200	1st	1
2	180	2nd	2
3	160	3rd	3
4	140	4th	4
5	120	5th	5
6	100	6th	6
7	80	7th	7
8	60	8th	8
9	40	9th	9
10	20	10th	10
11	0	11th	11
12	0	12th	12
13	0	13th	13
14	0	14th	14
15	0	15th	15
16	0	16th	16
17	0	17th	17
18	0	18th	18
19	0	19th	19
20	0	20th	20

High Individuals Market Division

[illegible]

High Teams _____

[illegible]

